



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this noon-tide altar may we be vividly conscious that we need turn not back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak no longer to us now. Forgive us that we talk so much and are silent so seldom, that we are in such constant motion and are so rarely still; that we depend so implicitly on the effectiveness of our organizations and our own contriving, and so little on the power of Thy spirit.

O God, who hast called our Nation to a position of trust and responsibility throughout the world, we confess before Thee with shame all that has been evil in our history and all the denials, the corruption and the dishonesty that even now make us unworthy to be called a Christian people. Take from us, we beseech Thee, all pride, greed, and injustice; and grant to us the spirit of unselfish service which alone can make us free. Make pure our motives, ridding us as a nation of all base desire for self-advantage which does not include the weal of all lands. So hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 25, 1951, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 271) to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Offices of the Appropriations Committee was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### REPORT ON THE MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 119)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 329 (81st Cong., 1st Sess., 63 Stat. 714), I submit the Second Semiannual Report on the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, covering the period from April 6, 1950 to October 6, 1950.

In making this submission I can do no better than to reiterate the following words which were contained in my letter submitting the First Semiannual Report on June 1, 1950:

By its enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and by its earlier provision of aid for Greece and Turkey, the Congress of the United States recognized that the security of the United States required a strengthening of the will and ability of certain free nations to resist the aggression with which they were threatened. The preservation of world peace in a form which free peo-

ples could accept depended then, as it depends now, upon the physical capacity and moral determination of the free world to stem those forces which seek to cloak the whole earth with the mantle of totalitarianism. The mutual defense assistance program represents one part of our effort to assist in the development of this essential capacity and determination and, as the attached report clearly demonstrates, is, and must continue to be, an integral part of the total policy of the United States.

Events since that time have proved beyond reasonable doubt the truth of these principles.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The White House, April 25, 1951.

(Enclosure: Second Semiannual Report on the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.)

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THYE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

### "Resolution 9

"Joint resolution memorializing the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of Interior and the Congress of the United States to take necessary action to assure equal treatment for Minnesota as compared with North Dakota and other States in respect to seasons and bag limits under presently defined flyways

"Whereas the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D. C., determined in 1950, the existence of four separate flyways, namely, the Atlantic, Mississippi, Central, and Pacific flyways, and allotted to the Mississippi flyway, including the State of Minnesota, a 35-day season on wild fowl and a daily bag limit on ducks of four and eight in possession, with a similar season for geese; and allotted to the Central flyway, including the State of North Dakota, a 45-day season with a daily bag limit on ducks of 5 and 10 in possession with a similar season on geese; and

"Whereas the division of the Mississippi and the Central flyways having in common the border between North Dakota and Minnesota effects an unwarranted discrimination against the people of Minnesota as these two States have similar local nesting conditions and experience similar overlapping flights of wild fowl in season; and

"Whereas Minnesota has cooperated with the Fish and Wildlife Service and Federal authorities at all times, notably setting aside refuges for water fowl of far more acreage than any other State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota—

"(1) That the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., be requested to reclassify

Minnesota in respect to its determination of flyways so that the States of North Dakota and Minnesota enjoy equal privileges under such reclassification of flyways and the States allotted thereto;

"(2) That copies of this resolution be sent to Albert M. Day, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D. C., to the Secretary of the Interior at Washington, D. C., and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,

*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,

*"President of the Senate.*

"Passed the house of representatives the 10th day of April 1951.

"G. H. LEAHY,

*"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate the 17th day of April 1951.

"H. Y. TORREY,

*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Approved April 20, 1951.

"LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,

*"Governor of the State of Minnesota."*

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the recent curtailment of metals to industries and businesses in the State of Rhode Island, including such raw materials as aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, and pig iron, and also scrap machinery

"Whereas Rhode Island, a highly industrialized State, has many small manufacturing plants and other industries and businesses which are suffering a real hardship because of a curtailment of metals required for defense production: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are earnestly requested to make an immediate survey of the situation at present existing regarding the curtailment of materials required for defense production in industries and businesses in the State of Rhode Island, including such raw materials as aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, and pig iron, and also scrap machinery and of chemicals, and to take prompt action in order to initiate remedies which will alleviate the hardship to industry because of such curtailment; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. HOEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relating to Federal aid in the development of inlets, harbors, ports, and inland waterways of North Carolina

"Whereas it is known that the cost of any permanent work done on these projects has to be borne by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas we recognize the great value these inlets, inland waterways, and harbors have in the economic life of North Carolina and more especially eastern North Carolina; and

"Whereas the North Carolina Members of Congress are a great power in our Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)—

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina hereby respectfully requests the North Carolina Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert all proper influence and use all available means at their

command in an effort to have the Federal Government proceed with a program of development and improvement of the inlets, harbors, ports, and inland waterways which are of such vital importance not only to the economic life of this State, but to the entire Nation in the furtherance of its defense program.

"SEC. 2. The governor of the State of North Carolina is respectfully requested to join with our Senators and Representatives in Congress in a concerted effort to secure necessary Federal appropriations to give effect to an adequate program of development, with particular regard to the deepening and widening of the several inlets leading into our harbors and inland waterways, including specifically Lockwood's Folly Inlet and Shallotte Inlet, in Brunswick County, and Oregon Inlet, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet, in Dare County, these inlets being vitally necessary to the commercial fishing industry of the adjoining sections.

"SEC. 3. The secretary of state is requested to furnish copies of this resolution, properly authenticated and bearing the seal of the State, to the Honorable Kerr Scott, Governor of North Carolina, and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, with appropriate expressions of respect.

"SEC. 4. This resolution shall become effective from and after its ratification.

"In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 14th day of April 1951.

"H. P. TAYLOR,

*"President of the Senate.*

"W. FRANK TAYLOR,

*"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

#### PROPOSED IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF STATE— RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ALLEGAN, MICH.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Allegan, Mich., relating to a proposed investigation and impeachment of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is the judgment of the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, Mich., that—

1. Shortly after the cessation of hostilities in World War II it became apparent to most intelligent people that the Communist government of Russia had dedicated itself to the expansion of communism and the destruction of the free nations of the world;

2. Despite the necessity of opposing communism by the use of all reasonable and available means and forces in the best interest and security of the United States, President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson did, contrary to our welfare and security, aid and abet communism in China and withheld material aid and support from Nationalist China;

3. President Truman and Secretary Acheson did, precedent to June of 1950, contrary to a legislative enactment of the Congress of the United States, with apparent intent to circumvent and evade the will of Congress, arbitrarily and willfully refuse to advance to the government of the Republic of Korea upwards of ten billions of dollars, appropriated by the Congress for the defense of said republic against a possible attack by the Communists of North Korea;

4. By reason of the direct aid given to Red China and the refusal of our State Depart-

ment to render aid to Nationalist China, and the refusal to advance the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the defense of South Korea, the Communists of North Korea were enabled to, and did, in June of 1950, launch a successful invasion of South Korea, and in which they were later fortified and assisted by Red Chinese armies;

5. Immediately thereafter President Truman did, contrary to his constitutional authority, engage these United States in a war, under the guise and pretext that he was acting under authority of the United Nations and engaging solely in a police action;

6. Having involved this Nation illegally in a war in Korea, the President and the Secretary of State did, in contradiction to the security and welfare of the Armed Forces committed to action in Korea and under his command, arbitrarily refuse authority to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to (a) bomb the staging areas and sources of supply for the Communist hordes, located across the Korean border in Manchuria; (b) blockade the coast of Red China so as to prevent the shipment of supplies and war matériel to Red China; (c) use the armies of Nationalist China stationed on Formosa; (d) equip and arm an estimated 500,000 South Koreans, able, willing, and anxious to fight;

7. By reason of the foregoing acts and policies, thousands of our American men have now become casualties of war, to be followed by untold thousands;

8. General MacArthur did, from bitter experience and first-hand knowledge, in the interest of those fighting under him and for the ultimate security of this Nation, properly and openly publicize his request for authority to wage a war as it should be waged, successfully;

9. President Truman did, we believe at the instigation of Secretary Acheson and by reason of the influence exerted by the British Foreign Office, without justification and contrary to the welfare and security of this Nation, which he has sworn to defend, summarily remove General MacArthur from his position of command in the Asiatic theater;

10. General MacArthur has, insofar as it was within his power to do so, acted in the best interest of those serving under his command and this Nation, and President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson are guilty of gross neglect and incompetence in office and the usurpation of authority to the detriment of and danger to the United States;

Therefore the City Council of the City of Allegan, Allegan County, State of Michigan, memorializes the Congress of the United States to institute an investigation, and if the findings warrant carry out proceedings appropriate to impeach and remove from office the President of the United States, Mr. Harry S. Truman, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, as we firmly believe such action is necessary for the safety, security, and future welfare of this Nation.

#### PETITION TO PRESIDENT REGARDING AMERICA'S MORAL STANDARDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day I received from Rev. Brainard Gibbons, pastor of the First Universalist Church of Wausau, a most interesting communication regarding a community effort which had been sparked by a sermon he had preached on the subject of moral termites. Reverend Gibbons included the text of a petition to President Truman which had been signed by members of his church and other folks in the community. I believe that the subject of this petition will be of deep interest to my colleagues in the Senate. It calls for a spiritual rebirth



on the part of all of us, a rebirth which I for one believe is absolutely indispensable if America is to meet the grave challenge of these times. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this splendid petition be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As citizens of the United States, we want to convey these thoughts to you, the Executive head of our Government, and through you to the Congress and all our fellow countrymen.

Revelations during the last few years of widespread corruption among private citizens and those in positions of public trust are startling and alarming. The internal decay of American morality is a more ominous threat to the ultimate security and well-being of our country than that presented by any external or foreign power.

Pending definite proof, we do not presume to pass judgment on any particular individuals or groups. However, in the larger sense, we can now recognize and confess our own shortcomings which make us fundamentally responsible for this sorry state of affairs. We have been too lax in our own moral standards, too careless in our study of governmental problems, and too indifferent in our election of others to public office.

Therefore, we propose taking two basic steps in an effort to remedy these conditions which place our Nation in such dire jeopardy. First, we shall endeavor to lift our own lives to the highest level of personal morality. Second, we shall attempt to meet our civil duties more conscientiously and intelligently. Issues shall be determined solely by the standard of what is good for all and without concern for partisan politics. Elective offices shall be filled only by those well qualified and of staunch moral integrity, without regard for party labels.

The situation is serious and demands nothing less than a moral rejuvenation, a spiritual rebirth of the American people. To that end we pledge ourselves and so covenant with you, each other, and all citizens of our beloved country.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union; with amendments (Rept. No. 298).

#### EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India and I submit a report (No. 297) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a 1-minute statement in connection with the reporting of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed as requested.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last Friday the Committee on Foreign Relations, without a dissenting vote, or-

dered reported S. 872, a bill to furnish emergency food aid to India. It is my privilege today to file the report of the committee on this important bill.

This bill authorizes the sending of 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India, at a cost of about \$190,000,000. Half of this, or \$95,000,000, is to be in the form of a gift. In effect, each American will need to take less than \$1 from his pocket to help India meet the famine which threatens. My mail shows that most Americans are glad to be a part of this humanitarian program.

S. 872 was introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for himself and 29 other Senators. I want at this time to commend him and his co-sponsors for the initiative they took in urging the President to give most careful attention to the critical food situation in India.

I hope my colleagues will read this report carefully and will study the bill, so that as soon as possible we may start wheat shipments to our friends in India, many of whom are this very day starving because of food shortages in that country.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1387. A bill to allow a deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes to individuals and corporations for contributions to certain organizations for certain purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1388. A bill for the relief of Wei Yuan and S. T. Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1389. A bill to reorganize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. (See remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NIXON (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1390. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. NIXON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1391. A bill to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1392. A bill to authorize a \$100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation or from other tribal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1393. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1394. A bill to provide additional benefits for dependents of deceased employees of Pacific naval base contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Antonino Tralonga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1396. A bill providing for per capita payments to the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAYBANK (by request):

S. 1397. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Abraham Jakob Hirschfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Annie Litke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PROTECTION OF COMMITTEE WITNESSES FROM DISCHARGE BY SUPERIOR OFFICERS

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from California may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 1390) to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate today a bill to make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Government to dismiss or otherwise discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

In the next few days congressional committees will open hearings on our far-eastern policy, the conduct of the Korean War, and the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President. It is essential to the security of the Nation and the very lives of the people, as we look into these vitally important issues, that every witness have complete freedom from reprisal when he is given an opportunity to tell what he knows.

There is too much at stake to permit foreign policy and military strategy to be established on the basis of half truths and the suppression of testimony.

Unless protection is given to witnesses who are members of the armed services or employees of the Government, the scheduled hearings will amount to no

more than a parade of yes men for administration policies as they exist.

The bill I have introduced is designed to assure any member of the Armed Forces or other officer or employee of the Government who can offer pertinent and constructive testimony that he can speak the truth without suffering the fate of Admiral Denfeld on account of such testimony.

#### AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill making it a punishable offense to employ an alien not lawfully in the United States.

The present law, title 8, section 144, USCA, makes it unlawful to bring in aliens to the country or to harbor or conceal them, when such aliens have not been duly admitted by an immigration inspector. The punishment is set at a maximum fine of \$2,000 and imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years per alien brought in. A hiatus in the statute does not affix any penalty for concealing and harboring aliens. The Supreme Court upheld this view in *U. S. v. Evans* (333 U. S. 483). Accordingly, Senator McCARRAN's omnibus immigration bill contains a revision of the said section providing a penalty for harboring and concealing aliens, as well as the existing penalty for causing or assisting them to enter the country.

In creating an offense of employing an illegally entered alien, the language of my proposed bill tracks exactly that of S. 716, and in addition supplements it with "or any person who shall employ any alien when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully in the United States, or any person who, having employed an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully in the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer."

The latter portion of the added material relates to an employer, who, subsequent to a good-faith hiring, discovers that his employee is not lawfully in the United States. Such an employer must promptly report the presence of his alien employee to an immigration officer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1391) to amend section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on

the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 8 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 144) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. Any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, commanding officer, agent or consignee of any means of transportation who—

"(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or

"(2) conceals or harbors, or attempts to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation,

any alien, including an alien crewman, not duly admitted by an immigration officer or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, or any person who shall employ any alien when such person knows or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect or by reasonable inquiry could have ascertained that such alien is not lawfully within the United States, or any person who, having employed an alien without knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that such alien is unlawfully within the United States and who could not have obtained such information by reasonable inquiry at the time of giving such employment, shall obtain information during the course of such employment indicating that such alien is not lawfully within the United States and shall fail to report such information promptly to an immigration officer, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this section occurs."

#### HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FROM S. 656

Mr. NEELY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of S. 656, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia.

#### AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, dealing with the possible use of American Indians.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

#### PRINTING OF REPORTS RELATING TO INVESTIGATION OF PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (S. DOCS. NOS. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, AND 34)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that six recent reports of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed

Services be printed as Senate documents. They are, Eighth report, Improper Payments Made To Procure Freight Traffic Through Port of Orange, Tex., 1951; ninth report, Military Indoctrination Centers; tenth report, Fort Jackson, S. C.; eleventh report, Camp Chaffee, Ark.; twelfth report, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.; and thirteenth report, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif.

The subcommittee has made thorough investigations and its efforts have already resulted in constructive steps being taken. We are confident that additional steps will be taken as a result of the subcommittee's findings and recommendations. I am sure Senators will be interested in reading these reports, and I ask that they be printed as Senate documents, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

An address delivered by him on the "Truman-MacArthur Controversy," broadcast from Station WWL in New Orleans, La., on April 24, 1951.

By Mr. MARTIN:

A broadcast by him on April 23, 1951, to the people of Pennsylvania, entitled "Happenings in Washington, Program No. 39."

By Mr. MARTIN:

An editorial from a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal paying tribute to the late Gen. Charles G. Dawes.

By Mr. GREEN:

An editorial entitled "Senator BLAIR Moody," published in the Providence Journal of Wednesday, April 25, 1951.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Project and United States Steel Needs," from the Moline (Ill.) Dispatch of March 10, 1951, and an editorial entitled "A Seaway and Mistaken Economics," from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of March 11, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

An article entitled "Who is Letting Our GI's Down?" written by Erle Cocke, Jr., and published in the May 1951 issue of the American Legion magazine, discussing the war in Korea.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

An article entitled "The Treason of 'Liberalism'" written by Forrest Davis and published in the Freeman for February 12, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Article entitled "State Department Ousts 55 as Security Risks," published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 26, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

A letter from Theodore A. Marks, published in the Democrat, of Flemington, N. J., of April 19, 1951, under the caption "Sees calamity ahead for agriculture and the Nation."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statements by the National Planning Association and the Citizens Conference on International Economic Union, relating to the proposal to furnish food for India.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

An article entitled "MacArthur Practices an Adroit Deception," written by Robert L. Riggs, and published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 22, 1951.



By Mr. HENNINGS:

An editorial entitled "General MacArthur's Address," published in the St. Louis Star-Times of April 20, 1951, discussing the recent address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the two Houses of Congress in joint meeting.

By Mr. WELKER:

An article entitled "Loyalty of Japanese Shaken," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1951, referring to the effect of the recall of General MacArthur on the Japanese.

**PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE PROCEDURES OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—LETTERS FROM ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AND JOHN T. JONES**

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 29, 1951, the senior Senator from Ohio introduced a bill, S. 1222, to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and according to the title "To provide for improved procedures of the National Labor Relations Board and to expedite its disposition of cases." In introducing the bill, the senior Senator from Ohio, as reported on page 2963 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stated that "it is a bill recommended by a Committee of the American Bar Association, with general agreement between labor, management, and other parties interested, to speed up the procedural features of the National Labor Relations Act."

It appears, to the contrary, that certain important segments of labor are vigorously opposed to the Taft bill. I recently received a letter dated April 4, 1951, from Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and a letter dated April 12, 1951, signed by Mr. John T. Jones, director of Labor's Non-Partisan League of the United Mine Workers of America, both of which express vigorous opposition to S. 1222.

I ask unanimous consent that these two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,  
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1951.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: On March 29, 1951, Senator TAFT introduced a bill, S. 1222, to amend certain of the procedural provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. In introducing the bill, Senator TAFT stated on the floor of the Senate that the bill was recommended by a committee of the American Bar Association "with general agreement between labor, management, and other parties interested, to speed up the procedural features of the National Labor Relations Act."

Senator TAFT's statement that the bill has the general agreement of labor is not correct. The Congress of Industrial Organizations does not support the bill, but opposes it.

The principal purpose of the bill is to facilitate the development of a prehearing motions procedure before the National Labor Relations Board. The asserted justification for such a procedure is that it might permit some cases finally to be disposed of upon a motion to dismiss the complaint, thus eliminating the necessity for hearings in such cases. The CIO is, of course, strongly in

favor of speeding up the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board. The CIO has probably suffered greater injury from the dilatory character of the Board's processes than has any other organization. However, it is our belief that the institution of a prehearing motions procedure would serve further to delay Labor Board procedures rather than to expedite them. The motions procedure contemplated by the bill would require a detailed complaint to be drafted by the Board in each unfair labor practice case, and a motion to dismiss the complaint would inevitably be filed in every case in which an employer was the respondent. The creation of this additional procedural step would not normally speed up Board processes. For every case which would be finally disposed of on a motion to dismiss there would be hundreds in which motions to dismiss would be filed simply for purposes of delay.

Moreover, the development of a motions procedure would further complicate and legalize the Board's procedures. In our opinion those procedures are far too complicated and legalistic now. It should not be forgotten that unions and workers are, of necessity, often represented in Board proceedings by laymen.

For these reasons we oppose the bill.

The bill is a product of a subcommittee of the section on labor relations of the American Bar Association. The subcommittee was comprised of various lawyers practicing before the National Labor Relations Board, some of whom represent employers and others of whom represent labor unions. It was explicitly understood that the subcommittee members were in their deliberations simply expressing their own personal views and not those of their clients. In any event, however, the only attorney on the subcommittee who represents the CIO or any of its affiliated unions opposed the motions practice proposal from the outset. Thus there has never been even the slightest basis for supposing that the CIO would support the bill.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,  
General Counsel.

LABOR'S NON-PARTISAN LEAGUE,  
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1951.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,  
Chairman, Labor and Public Welfare Committee,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: On March 29, 1951, Senator TAFT, of Ohio, introduced Senate bill No. 1222 to amend the Taft-Hartley law. He issued a statement that this bill had the general approval of labor. I wish to advise you that this statement is incorrect insofar as the United Mine Workers of America is concerned. This organization has not changed its position with respect to the Taft-Hartley law. We still favor its outright repeal and we are opposed to Senate bill No. 1222 or any other bill that may be introduced that would tend to modify the infamous slave law.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. JONES,  
Director, Labor's Non-Partisan League.

**PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING FOREIGN POLICY**

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor. Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recog-

nized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read resolution (S. Res. 132), as follows:

*Resolved*, That in keeping with the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to raise and support Armed Forces (art. 1, sec. 8), and in keeping with the constitutional prerogative of the Senate to advise the President in the making of treaties (art. 2, sec. 2), the Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, be and hereby are directed to investigate, study, and report recommendations on the following matters:

(1) Commitments of the Executive to foreign governments, including the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Agreements, and policies and actions by the Secretary of State pursuant thereto;

(2) Action of the President in ordering Armed Forces of the United States into combat in Korea on June 25, 1950, including a determination as to whether the President had authority to issue such order;

(3) Whether any binding commitments have been made to the United Nations or any members thereof that limit freedom of decision and action by the United States in prosecuting the war in Korea to peace with honor;

(4) Dependability of the United Nations as now constituted to restore peace and order in Korea with honor and to deter world war; proposals for perfecting the United Nations as a peace-maintaining organization;

(5) All facts and circumstances bearing on the summary removal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his commands as Supreme Commander, Allied Powers; Commander in Chief, United Nations Commands; Commander in Chief, Far East; and Commanding General, United States Army, Far East, including official communications between General MacArthur, Department of Defense officials, and officers and others in the executive branch, together with any orders or communications bearing upon such removal;

(6) whether the Senate should advise the President that Dean G. Acheson, as Secretary of State, has lost the confidence of the American people and should be removed in the public interest;

(7) effectiveness of air and sea power as major deterrents to war and decisive weapons for victory if world war comes, comparing the relative cost in manpower, financial and other resources of maintaining mastery of the air and seas with that of a defense policy based upon ground forces as the decisive factor, and also comparing resources of a potential enemy for ground warfare and vulnerability of such potential enemy's war industrial potential to demolition by air power, as well as the importance of having mastery of the air for defense of United States industrial centers against destruction by such potential enemy;

(8) the proposals by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as made to a joint meeting of the Congress on April 19, 1951, and stated by him as follows:

"Our victory was complete and our objectives within reach when Red China intervened with numerically superior ground forces. This created a new war and an entirely new situation, a situation not contemplated when our forces were committed against the North Korean invaders, a situation which called for new decisions in the

diplomatic sphere to permit the realistic adjustment of military strategy. Such decisions have not been forthcoming.

"While no man in his right mind would advocate sending our Ground Forces into continental China—and such was never given a thought—the new situation did urgently demand a drastic revision of strategic planning if our political aim was to defeat this new enemy as we had defeated the old.

"Apart from the military need as I saw it to neutralize sanctuary protection given to the enemy north of the Yalu, I felt that military necessity in the conduct of the war made necessary:

"First, the intensification of our economic blockade against China.

"Second, the imposition of a naval blockade against the China coast.

"Third, removal of restrictions on air reconnaissance of China's coastal areas and of Manchuria.

"Fourth, removal of restrictions on the forces of the Republic of China on Formosa with logistical support to contribute to their effective operation against the Chinese mainland.

"For entertaining these views all professionally designed to support our forces committed to Korea and bring hostilities to an end with the least possible delay and at a saving of countless American and Allied lives, I have been severely criticized in lay circles, principally abroad, despite my understanding that from a military standpoint the above views have been fully shared in the past by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff."

(9) whether as a matter of military urgency Formosa must under no circumstances be allowed to fall under Communist control;

(10) action taken by the Executive and progress made toward collaboration of Pacific nations for mutual defense against Communist aggression;

(11) progress of North Atlantic Treaty nations in arming and expansion of defense forces for self-defense and mutual aid since the Senate ratified the treaty on July 21, 1949;

(12) whether the United States should make separate mutual defense treaties with individual nations, including Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services, jointly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under a unanimous-consent agreement that I may yield for insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, with respect to the resolution which was referred, I did not understand that opportunity was given for objection to the reference of the resolution. The resolution was more like a speech. I think opportunity should be given to object to the referral before the resolution is referred to the two committees sitting jointly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object to the resolution being so referred?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] present before the action is taken. I object temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the order of the distinguished occupant of the chair was to refer the resolution to the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, jointly. No objection was made.

Mr. McFARLAND. No opportunity was given to object.

Mr. WHERRY. It certainly was.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; there was no opportunity, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska submitted a resolution and asked unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly. The present occupant of the chair then stated that the resolution would be accepted and referred. Then I asked permission for the clerk to read the resolution, and after the clerk read the resolution the distinguished occupant of the chair stated that it would be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly.

Mr. McFARLAND. After the resolution was read, no opportunity was given to object. I certainly am not going to stand here and permit a resolution to be offered and referred when no opportunity is given to object. I do not know that I shall have any objection, but I do think that opportunity should be afforded to object. I want Senators who are interested in the subject to be present. Opportunity was not given to object. If it had been given, I would have objected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that when objection was asked for none was heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be read. Objection was not asked for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The official reporter will read the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. The question was not asked as to whether there was any objection, after the resolution was read. The Chair merely referred it without giving me the opportunity to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given before the resolution was read.

Mr. McFARLAND. I take it that the rules require that a resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rules require that it be referred to a committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I did not hear. Someone was talking to me when the request was made. I did not hear the first request. It certainly is an unusual procedure for a resolution to be referred, or to have a request that it be referred, before it is read. One of my colleagues was talking to me, and if such a request was made I did not hear it. I think I should be given the opportunity to make objection. The other evening I withdrew a motion which I had made in order to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. I think it is no more than fair that I be given the opportunity to object, if I desire to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us get the record straight. It is necessary to ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution,

because the Senate is in session following a recess. The junior Senator from Nebraska was on his feet, and in terms that everyone could hear, he asked unanimous consent to send to the desk a resolution. He asked that he be permitted to offer it, and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, jointly. The distinguished occupant of the chair asked if there was any objection. There was none, and he made the order. After that I said to the distinguished occupant of the chair that I would like to have the clerk read the resolution. The resolution was read; and after the resolution was read the distinguished occupant of the chair ordered that it be referred, as he had already done.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; but I was not given an opportunity to object after it was read.

Mr. WHERRY. The order had already been made. It was not necessary to have opportunity for objection then. I was perfectly fair about it. I asked unanimous consent, which was granted. I did not have to have the resolution read, but I thought it ought to be in the body of the RECORD. That is the reason why I asked that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reporter will read the RECORD.

The Official Reporter (Charles J. Drescher) read as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

(Here the resolution was read.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McFARLAND. Where is the unanimous consent to have it referred? It is not there. I submit that I still have the right to object, because the RECORD, as read by the reporter, does not include unanimous consent to have the resolution referred.

Mr. WHERRY. If the reporter will go back and read from the beginning, I used that exact language. I asked unanimous consent to offer the resolution which I sent to the desk.

Mr. McFARLAND. The reporter has read his notes, and that is what we go by.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the reporter read all his notes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reporter will read all of his notes.

The Official Reporter read as follows:

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without speeches.



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be referred jointly to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution.

(Here the resolution was read.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit that no request was made for unanimous consent to refer the resolution. The request was merely that it be read. Unanimous consent would be required before it could be referred. Under those circumstances the Chair had no right to order that it be referred. The Senator from Nebraska did not ask unanimous consent that it be referred.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the Journal Clerk read the Journal entry, because I am as sure as that I am standing here that I asked unanimous consent not only that the resolution be introduced, but that it be referred. I believe that Members of the Senate heard me do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am going by what the reporter has said. I did not hear any such request. If I had heard it, I would have objected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a reading of the Journal entry.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. What do we go by? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal is the official record of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Journal entry show?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Journal Clerk that the Journal shows that unanimous consent was given before the resolution was read.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it certainly is strange that I did not hear any unanimous-consent request, that the reporter did not hear any unanimous consent request, but that the Journal Clerk did.

I now ask unanimous consent that the order referring the resolution be vacated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator move that it be vacated?

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that it be vacated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona moves that the order referring the resolution be vacated.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Duff	Lehman	Taft
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eaton	McCarran	Tobey
Ellender	McCarthy	Underwood
Ferguson	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	McFarland	Welker
Frear	McKellar	Wherry
Fulbright	McMahon	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young
Green	Maybank	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. During the quorum call the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has had opportunity to examine the resolution. That was the thing I wanted done; to give opportunity for the interested Senators to be on the floor.

I submit that orderly procedure was not followed here today. When the Official Reporter read the record, and it read one way I submit that the distinguished minority leader should have been willing to abide by what the Official Reporter said the record was. Certainly since I have been majority leader I have never failed to withdraw a request if the minority leader requested me to do so. I do not feel I was treated with the same courtesy. But for the reason that the Senator from Georgia has no objection to the resolution being referred to the joint committees, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish we could get along with the business of the Senate. I yield for the purpose of insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I merely wish to answer the majority leader.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator will not take too long.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator feels that 1 minute is so very important, which is all the time I want merely to make a modest reply to the majority leader, I will not ask for time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much that the majority leader withdrew his motion. Following the orderly procedure, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the two committees, the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee jointly.

#### ABOLITION OF STATE DEPARTMENT AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, routine matters may be presented to the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, it was agreed that Senators may submit routine matters for the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To make insertions in the RECORD without debate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and, if I may, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I should like to read a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to abolish the State Department as presently constituted and to establish a Department of Foreign Affairs with five divisions on a functional basis.

The Secretary and the five Under Secretaries would be appointed by the President and be subject to confirmation by the Senate. For a period of 6 months from the dates of their confirmation, each Under Secretary would have full authority to remove any person in his division in the interests of economy, efficiency, and security.

The Secretary of Foreign Affairs would have the authority to abolish any of the existing bureaus or divisions in the Department or to assign them to one of the five functional divisions. The existing

bureaus and offices within the State Department are assigned by the bill to one of the functional divisions but could be abolished under the authority given.

Mr. President, this bill is offered as a contribution toward solving the basic twofold problem before the United States today. That problem is how to establish a foreign policy which will command substantial unity and how to place its administration in the hands of persons who will command confidence.

The method proposed will work. It is the same method used in the reorganization of the two Cabinet departments, War and Navy, into the present Department of Defense with its subdepartments of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The bill is simple, clear, and understandable. I hope that it may have the early consideration of the committee to which it is referred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1389) to reorganize the Department of State in the interest of economy, efficiency, and a more effective administration of foreign affairs, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) there is hereby established a department in the executive branch of the Government to be known as the "Department of Foreign Affairs" consisting of five divisions as follows:

- (1) The Division of Administration.
- (2) The Division of Foreign Affairs.
- (3) The Division of Information.
- (4) The Division of International Agencies.

(5) The Division of Trusteeships.  
(b) All functions, powers, and duties of the Department of State are hereby transferred to the Department of Foreign Affairs. The Department of State is hereby abolished.

SEC. 2. (a) The Department of Foreign Affairs shall be headed by a Secretary of Foreign Affairs who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum.

(b) All functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of State are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs. The office of Secretary of State is hereby abolished.

SEC. 3. The five divisions of the Department of Foreign Affairs shall be headed, respectively, by (1) an Under Secretary for Administration, (2) an Under Secretary for Foreign Service, (3) an Under Secretary for Information, (4) an Under Secretary for International Agencies, and (5) an Under Secretary for Trusteeships, each of whom shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$18,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. (a) Within the five divisions of the Department of Foreign Affairs, the following offices, bureaus, and other subdivisions are hereby established:

- (1) Division of Administration—
  - (a) Office of Personnel.
  - (b) Office of Operating Facilities.
  - (c) Office of Budget and Finance.
  - (d) International Claims Commission of the United States.

(e) Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service.

(f) Foreign Service Buildings Commission.

(2) Division of Foreign Service—

(a) Board of Foreign Service.

(b) Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asia, and African Affairs.

(c) Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

(d) Bureau of European Affairs.

(e) Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs.

(3) Division of Information—

(a) Office of International Trade Policy.

(b) Office of Financial and Development Policy.

(c) Office of Transportation and Communication Policy.

(d) Office of Public Affairs.

(e) Office of International Information.

(f) Office of Educational Exchange.

(g) Office of Consular Affairs.

(h) Office of Intelligence Research.

(i) Office of Library and Intelligence Acquisition.

(4) Division of International Agencies.

(a) Bureau of United Nations Affairs.

(b) Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

(c) United States Mission to the United Nations.

(d) Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.

(e) International Boundary Commission.

(f) Food and Agriculture Organization.

(g) International Labor Organization.

(h) All other multilateral international organizations in which the United States participates.

(5) Division of Trusteeships—

(a) Bureau of German Affairs.

(b) Philippine Alien Property Administration.

(c) Philippine War Damage Commission.

(d) South Pacific Commission.

(e) Bureau of Japanese Affairs.

(b) The Secretary of Foreign Affairs shall, in accord with the objectives of economy and efficiency, assign and transfer to the various offices, bureaus, and subdivisions established by subsection (a) all functions, powers, and duties of the various offices, bureaus and subdivisions of the Department of State: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, with the advice of the Bureau of the Budget, shall abolish any of the offices, bureaus, or subdivisions, existing or herein named when the objectives of economy and efficiency will be served thereby.

(c) For a period of 6 months from his confirmation, the Under Secretary for each division shall have the authority, without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service laws, as amended, to make such removals from the personnel of his division as he feels are necessary to achieve the maximum economy, efficiency, and security.

#### INCREASED COSTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to make a statement for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the production costs of farmers are higher today than they have ever been before. In view of an article which appeared in the newspapers last night, to the effect that the President is going to ask that agricultural prices be pegged, I wish to tell the Senate that any idea that nowadays farmers are riding a crest of high prices and prosperity does not jibe with the facts.

Members of the executive committee of the Farm Bureau, who met in Fargo late last week, said that a recent report

made by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in summarizing a committee study of farm income and expenditures, shows that in actual purchasing power the net income of American farmers in 1950 amounted to only about two-thirds of their net income in 1945; and farmers' production expenses in 1950 were 60 percent of their gross income, as compared with 52 percent of gross income in 1945.

The North Dakota Farm Bureau leaders said the Senate committee's report reveals that the costs of farm machinery have gone up by 60 percent, while prices of building and fencing materials increased by 70 percent between 1945 and 1950. Taxes paid by farmers also increased sharply, a total of 71 percent, in the 5-year period.

Prices paid by farmers for items used in production and family living, including interest, taxes, and wage rates of hired labor, increased 46 percent between 1945 and February 1951.

Net income for all agriculture has been skidding steadily since 1947, the report states. Farm income for 1950 was two and one-half times as much as farm income in the period 1935 to 1939, while labor income was three and one-half times as much, and corporate income was six times as much. I desired to bring these facts to the attention of Senators. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield, so that I may address a question to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from North Dakota to speak about the farmer's income having declined?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I not only agree with the Senator's statement, but I wish to say that, in dollars and cents, farm income is the only income of any group or segment in America which has continued to decline for the past 3 years. Despite what we read in the press about high prices, the farmer's income has gone down and down and down, as the Senator from North Dakota so ably expressed it.

Mr. LANGER. I might add, it has gone down and down and down and down and down. Let us get enough of those downs into the RECORD.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, on the same condition.

#### NOMINATION OF W. STUART SYMINGTON, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF RFC—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I wish to state that the committee held about a 2-hour hearing this morning. I ask that the nomination



be placed on the Executive Calendar until the hearings can be printed, in order that Senators may have the benefit of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question to be addressed to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. LANGER. When is it expected that the hearings on this nomination will be concluded?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that the hearings have been completed.

Mr. LANGER. When will the report be filed?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should think it would be delivered by the Printing Office within 2 or 3 days.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

**DELIVERY OF CRITICAL MATERIALS FROM WESTERN GERMANY TO THE COMMUNIST-DOMINATED EAST**

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to enable me to address the Senate for a period not to exceed 10 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Maryland for the purpose of a brief statement, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to bring to the attention of the Senate challenging facts just revealed to our Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies concerning deliveries of useful materials and supplies behind the iron curtain from Western Germany.

Recently, upon the increase of reports to us of the flow of critical materials from Western Germany to the Communist-dominated East, we dispatched a staff representative, Kenneth R. Hansen, to Europe. Yesterday he returned with first-hand information, gathered during a thorough and sweeping investigation of the subject.

The condition which is observed is extremely disturbing, particularly because the United States Government has authority and responsibility in its occupation of Western Germany.

This illegal flow of critical goods lessens substantially the ultimate effectiveness of the domestic export controls of the United States. We in this country cannot rest securely behind our export controls if Russia and the countries she dominates can obtain the materials they need from other sources. Our export controls may help us some, but they do not hurt the Communist areas unless there is parallel action throughout the Western World, including Western Germany.

The United States Government, through the Office of the High Commissioner for Germany, has for about 5 years past been in a position of authority and responsibility in Western Ger-

many. The subcommittee investigation is seeking to determine whether the responsible agencies of the United States Government have adequately and properly discharged their authority and responsibility with regard to the control of shipments of critical materials from Western Germany.

Shortly after his arrival in Germany, Mr. Hansen, accompanied by an official of the United States State Department, made an extensive tour of the interzonal border between Eastern and Western Germany and parts of the international border, personally observing the manner in which border authorities are checking items flowing between Western Germany and the East. He finds convincing evidence that the border authorities, with the exception of the United States Military Police Customs Unit, are either poorly trained, poorly instructed, or are interested almost solely in the collection of tariff duties on imports. They pay but scant attention to shipments which might contain critical goods going to the Communists.

The United States Military Police Customs Unit, although not fully trained for the job and certainly understaffed, has been the principal factor in stopping such eastward shipments of critical goods as have been stopped. This customs unit is the only unit which has been making any serious attempt to stop critical and strategic goods, and it is to be commended for its efforts in this regard. However, it must be pointed out that the activities of this unit cover only a portion of the international border and, only recently, a small portion of the interzonal border between Western and Eastern Germany. Almost all of the remaining outlets for German trade are under German control and supervision in any effective sense.

There are several other allied groups which have at various times attempted to supervise these points of exit, but no efforts beyond cursory observation and reporting have been possible because of lack of personnel and the policy followed that export controls should be a German responsibility. The net result of this has been that movements of goods across points under United States jurisdiction have decreased considerably and other points of exit not subject to United States control have increased correspondingly.

On his arrival in Germany the staff representative was not satisfied to accept word-of-mouth reports, nor even to make announced inspections of border check points. On the automobile tour of these points which he and other United States officials took, the check points were visited at almost any of the 24 hours of the day, sometimes at such hours as 2 or 4 o'clock in the morning. In this way the border points were not alerted for the inspection and the true state of affairs could be seen.

At one check point which was observed for about an hour before the presence of United States officials became known, trucks were being passed through at the rate of one every 3 minutes without examination of the loads, which ranged up to 30 tons per truck and trailer units.

It would be amusing to note, if it were not so grave, that after the presence of the United States group became known, the border officials spent 20 minutes checking one truckload of fish from Denmark.

The staff representative saw rail shipments, whole trains of goods, passing from the allied occupation areas to destinations behind the iron curtain with only cursory or no physical inspection of the shipments. These conditions prevail at a time when it has been publicly announced in a State Department press release dated March 6, 1951, that all West German export controls will be handed over to German officials within the near future.

There have been denials that deliveries of strategic materials were being made by our allies to the Communists. But our staff representative saw the shipments which were being made. Furthermore, it must not be thought these deplorable conditions were in the past. He saw them only a few days ago. They are continuing to exist this very day.

One of the most serious developments in the inspection tour was the inspection of a free port in Germany wherein port officials stated categorically that any goods entering the free port on the basis of any documentation acceptable to the German customs, and with practically no physical inspection of the items, can be loaded for any destination regardless of the consignees stated on the documents; that no report is rendered with respect to changed destination of cargoes; and that the only interest of any official nature is whether or not the loading and storage charges are paid.

This free port area similarly had not been visited or inspected by United States or allied officials for purposes of supervision of the adequacy of inspection operations, or to obtain an evaluation of the extent to which free ports are and have been used as an area of transshipment of strategic or critical materials to eastern-bloc destinations.

The committee representative, in his visit to this free port, ascertained that there is less than one chance in a thousand that an illegal shipment of critical goods will be detected and an even smaller chance that it will be stopped.

Much has been made in recent press releases of smuggling which has been carried on across the interzonal border, but with the border so open, in fact a virtual sieve for critical materials, it appears that smuggling need be resorted to only to take taxable luxury items across the border without paying the tax.

It appears to the subcommittee that the fundamental weakness of the German export licensing system as it is now constituted is one of the most important factors which contribute to the continuation of this illegal trade.

In a press release dated April 14, 1951, our subcommittee declared that there is evident laxity in controls imposed on shipments to Communist areas, with neither central nor competent authority exercising over-all jurisdiction.

One obvious and basic weakness of the present West German licensing system in effect in Western Germany is that over

300 banks which are empowered to deal in foreign exchange are also charged with the issuance of export licenses for a great range of commodities. The determination as to whether a certain item is of strategic or critical importance usually is made by bank clerks who are neither technically trained nor free of financial interest in the export transactions. This means, in effect, that local economic and political pressures can be brought to bear upon these bank licensing officials whose major interest is to encourage exports which will result in financial gains to the banks and their customers, the exporting firms. Certainly these bank clerks cannot be depended upon to make determinations adverse to the financial interests of their employers and clients, particularly when, as matters stand, there is almost no chance of a prosecution resulting from an improper issuance of a license even in the remote case of detection.

Another reason for the break-down is that unless the proposed shipment is specifically prohibited it will be approved. For instance, if a 20-ton crane is shown on the schedules as banned, they freely approve several shipments of 18-ton cranes or if a complete factory installation cannot be exported, they send a number of shipments labeled as spare parts and accessories which upon arrival are assembled into the complete installation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say that the Senator is doing a great service to the Nation in making this revelation. I think it is shocking that on the day when it was announced by representatives of the Kremlin that there would not be enough room in Korea for the white crosses over the bodies of American troops, this wholesale traffic in strategic materials to build up communism should be continuing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Maryland have at least two additional minutes in order to finish his remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a few remarks to make, myself.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked for only 2 minutes so that the Senator from Maryland could finish his statement.

Mr. O'CONOR. I have a few additional remarks to make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Maryland has already yielded for questions, and he asked for 10 minutes before he started his speech.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that there is no question today more serious than that which concerns the shipment of materials to our Communist foes. I know the Senator from Arkansas does think it important to hear the facts

which I can state in 2 minutes, and which reveal a shocking situation. I ask the Senator for two more minutes in order to bring to my colleague's attention facts which ought to make us ashamed of certain conditions which are now playing a great part in jeopardizing the lives of American boys.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator shall not yield for questions.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, instances are reported where manufacturers, upon noting the precise terms of a prohibition against specific shipments, merely alter the measurements and the critical materials move across the border into the hands of the Communists.

One definite indication that the Soviets are benefitting greatly by the deplorable conditions is that the Communist press now criticizes severely the work of our staff representative. Of course, they do not like any disclosures which might stop the flow of much-needed supplies to them.

It is announced that revisions of this procedure are to be sought by the United States officials in Western Germany, but it must be realized that this situation has been in effect without serious attempt at correction during a long and very critical period in West Germany's trade picture under steadily worsening international conditions with respect to east-west relations. During all this time no substantial corrective actions have actually been taken.

We believe that one step, but only one of many necessary steps, toward a solution of the problem lies in the establishment of a central licensing authority whereby the determinations of the strategic or critical nature of goods in the issuance of export licenses are placed in the hands of responsible and disinterested persons. Another step is tighter border controls, not just in the area under United States jurisdiction but all along the border.

This problem of illegal east-west trade is not a small one, but is measured in the tens of millions of dollars.

Many well-informed Allied and West German officials expressed conviction that the illegal trade is of such magnitude as to affect seriously the German trade balance of payments. The continuing adverse German balance of payments have been underwritten by the United States aid programs in the European Payments Union.

This means, in effect, that the United States taxpayer is paying for this illegal trade.

However, our grave concern in this problem is not limited to the monetary loss, great as it is. Even more overwhelming is the fact that uncontrolled trade of this nature strengthens the war potential of the Communist areas while bleeding critical materials from the West.

This situation must not be allowed to continue. We are deeply concerned and intend to continue reporting to the Senate the documentary and pictorial evi-

dence assembled by the staff. An interim report of the subcommittee's findings will be filed in the very near future.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for giving me additional time.

#### RADIO AND TELEVISION REPORTS OF TESTIMONY OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for approximately 30 seconds in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it was stated yesterday that I advocated television and radio reports of hearings on the MacArthur matter. I advocated nothing of the kind. I advocated public hearings. My personal opinion is that if I were conducting the hearings I would not permit radio and television coverage. No such suggestion was made by the Republican Policy Committee.

#### THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, ever since General MacArthur's speech on April 19, I, like so many others, have been trying to understand the full meaning of that dramatic occurrence. The tremendous outburst of emotion which the personality of the general evoked, has, I believe, obscured the true meaning of what the general said.

It is rare in history that a major question of governmental policy is presented so forcibly and so dramatically to a Nation as in the present case. General MacArthur has drawn the issue. It is now for the people and the Congress to make the decision.

I sense what the issue is. It is not, however, easy to translate it into simple words. In a broad sense, the issue is whether we should pursue the foreign policy we have been following since the last war or whether we should abruptly abandon it. In other words, are we to proceed as a great power in the grand imperial manner of the past or as a member of the United Nations, 1 among 60, seeking to preserve peace by the difficult democratic process of persuasion and compromise? General MacArthur's approach to the issue is in the traditional, orthodox pattern of the great empires of the past. His policy could succeed in the same way that such policies succeeded in the case of Napoleon, Victoria, or Kaiser Wilhelm. But such a policy cannot, in my opinion, bring lasting peace to the world. We could have, perhaps, a moment of imperial glory, yet I find it difficult to believe that we alone can impose peace upon a reluctant world.

Perhaps it may be useful if with this issue in mind we should examine some of our national characteristics. It is time for taking stock of ourselves with ruthless honesty lest we be beguiled into destroying ourselves.

Mr. President, we are a great people. We have not yet even approached the limits of our physical and spiritual strength. There is little that Americans cannot do if only they can imagine themselves wanting to do it. But we are not without defects in our national character.



We are usually more intent upon the immediate short-term job than upon the long-term task. The job is of today. It is perceptible in all its parts. We can set a time limit upon doing it and generally do it within the time set. Then we can go on to the next job. But the task is unlike this. We cannot always see what it involves. We cannot set a time limit and therefore being unable to finish it within a given period, we rebel against it. No one can beat us at doing a quick job. But our record as doers of long-term tasks is pretty poor. Thus we know how to win a war. But we don't know—or apparently don't care to know—how to win the peace. Twice within this generation we completed the quick job of winning the war and left undone the long task of winning the peace. That is why we are where we are today.

Our enemy does not look upon things as we do. He is presently engaged in the job of disrupting the world so that he may eventually take it over. But this is a task to which he set himself centuries ago. His eye—unlike ours—is less upon the battle than upon the campaign, and less upon the campaign than upon the war. We cherish time. Ours is the only radio system that operates upon split-second accuracy and, regardless of the importance of your message, you will be cut off if you exceed your allotted moments. Time being so precious among us, we count it in seconds, days, months, years. We are eaten up by impatience. But the Russian Communist who disdains time, reckons it in decades and centuries. We are an emotional people. The Communist is coldbloodedly calculating. We are moved by our hearts. He is responsive to his head. Many of the Russian Communists' characteristics are summed up by their behavior in one instance that occurred in the First World War. Then the victorious Germans, by the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, stripped them of a huge fraction of their territory. Some men in Russia's high councils wanted to continue the fight. But Lenin said no, and counselled them to silence. "Let the Germans have the territory," he said, "We shall get it back." He could not then know whether they would get it back in a year or a century. But, in Russian calculations, the belief is strong that the race is not always to the swift. Events proved, sooner than might have been expected, that Lenin was right.

Another of our defects is that we are a people enamored of the easy way. Yet, experience teaches that there is no easy way. Achievement, however, is had only at the price of pain and hard work. But, nonetheless, we became so persuaded of the easy way that not long ago many of us thought that to keep the peace we needed only the A-bomb and a few bombers to carry it to disturbers of the peace.

The dim realization that there is no easy way has caused us to fall—only temporarily, I hope—into a mood of petulant frustration. President Truman and General MacArthur are the focal points around which it has formed and erupted with considerable violence.

We are subject to a dangerous illusion. We tend to believe that complex national and international questions can somehow be solved; that is, forever and completely disposed of through the application of some sovereign panacea. This reflects credit upon the goodness of our hearts and the wholesomeness of our intentions, but it reflects less credit upon our thinking minds. For all history testifies that these problems cannot be solved through a remedy that will completely and forever dispose of them. They can be ameliorated; they cannot be solved. We have been told there is no substitute for victory; that somehow victory in arms will be a solution to our troubles. But we have had complete victory in two world wars within the last quarter of a century, and our troubles have increased. In our private lives, we, as individuals, do not ever entirely solve all of our problems with respect to God, our parents, our wives, our children, or our Government. Yet this does not prevent us from leading happy and useful lives. But collectively, as a nation, we cling to the notion that complex problems can be solved, and when we find that this is not true we recoil from them in the mood of a spoiled child who won't play at all unless the terms of the playing are entirely to his satisfaction.

These are some of the factors in our national character against which we must be vigilant. There is still another worthy of our attention. We are impatient of ideas.

We are often obsessed by the desire for action. But it is not unreasonable to ask that ideas precede action. We must never take action for action's sake alone. To do so is to renounce reason and invite disaster. Action for action's sake is merely the refuge of the intellectually impotent; a confession of mental bankruptcy. But we glorify action and the man of action while depreciating ideas and the man of ideas; so, too, we exalt impatience and deplore patience. To patience, some give the ugly name appeasement. Here let me recall the words of a great man who is a man both of ideas and of action. This is what he said not very long ago:

Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp, clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in a majority of instances, they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands. How many misunderstandings which led to wars could have been removed by temporizing.

The Sermon on the Mount is the last word in Christian ethics. Everyone respects the Quakers. Still, it is not on these terms that ministers assume their responsibilities of guiding states. Their duty is first so to deal with other nations as to avoid strife and war and to eschew aggression in all its forms. But the safety of the state, the lives and freedom of their own countrymen, \* \* \* may make it right and imperative in the last

resort \* \* \* that the use of force should not be excluded. \* \* \*

And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind throughout its history has been so frequently impaled.

The man who wrote these words has had more experience of war and statecraft than any man of our times. His name is Winston Churchill.

We are now confronted by one of the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. We shall live or die by the manner in which we solve it, saving or condemning the rest of the free world as we go.

Now, let us consider as objectively as we possibly can the issues in the Truman-MacArthur controversy. No one, I think, seriously questions President Truman's authority to dismiss General MacArthur as commander of our Far East forces. The subordination of the military to the civilian authority in our political system was long ago decided in terms of the maxim that "when two ride a horse, one must go in front." Our founding fathers decided that the President is the front rider as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. If the Nation is not now content with this solution of the question by the founding fathers, it may change the President's place on the horse by amending the Constitution. But until it does so, he remains the front rider. One may approve or disapprove of his action in a given case. But no one may reasonably doubt his authority.

Beyond this, there are many military, political, and politico-military questions involved in the present controversy. In our complicated world it is often impossible to say what is a strictly military question, since it is also so often bound up with the political; and what may be meat to the military may be poison to the political. Winning a battle, we may lose a war. I am painfully aware, in this discussion, of my lack of competence as a military expert. My distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TART), however, would place more emphasis upon our Navy and Air Force than upon our Ground Forces and he does this with great assurance because he has perhaps a greater military knowledge than I have. But I, less assured in my ignorance, am willing, on strictly military matters, to be guided by the advice of our Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense, all of whom are military experts tried in the crucible of war. They may be wrong and if they are we shall grievously suffer, but they are our military advisers and while their word is not law until the Congress enacts it into law, it is highly persuasive; certainly to one who, like myself, is not a military expert.

General MacArthur's views on the bombing of Red China, whether or not it bombs our bases in Korea and Japan, are opposed not only by his own Government, but also by the governments of the free world, on military and political grounds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas has great respect for the point of view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is he aware of the fact that only a year ago the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that they would not consider spending \$20,000,000,000 on the Armed Forces, and that the \$13,000,000,000 which was provided was ample for the defense of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that I left the impression that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are omniscient in every respect. I think when they give an estimate of their immediate needs, as a military matter, there still remains an overall decision to be made by those whose responsibility is much broader. That certainly includes our political authority, including the Senate. I am quite unable to see how that particular matter has any pertinence to the question I am discussing.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator says that we must follow the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I suggest that today they say that it requires four times as much money and forces to defend the United States as they said was necessary 1 year ago today. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are the same individuals who made the statement a year ago.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I said a moment ago was that, I not being a military expert, the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in any particular instance on a military question is highly persuasive with me. It still is. In this instance, as I shall try to develop in the succeeding paragraphs, the Joint Chiefs of Staff by no means stand alone in their view as to the military wisdom of their position.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read to the Senator what General Bradley said on March 15, 1950:

So if we came here and recommended to you a \$30,000,000,000 or \$40,000,000,000 budget for defense, I think we would be doing a disservice and that maybe you should get a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff if I were the one who did that.

Senator WHERRY. Well, of course, your recommendations in the beginning were much higher than that.

General BRADLEY. We had some other recommendations based, however, on unilateral—

Senator WHERRY. That might be true, but they totaled more than the \$13,100,000,000.

General BRADLEY. The Joint Chiefs of Staff never went along with this great big figure of \$20,000,000,000.

That was their military opinion at that time. Today their military opinion is that we must spend \$60,000,000,000 to meet exactly the same threat which existed 1 year ago today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me point out to the Senator that I am certainly not saying that the Joint Chiefs of Staff or anyone else can foresee the future. At that time, with the knowledge then available, that was probably a very reasonable position. Does the Senator take the position that at that time he fore-

saw the Korean War, and that at that time, March 1950, he differed with the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I accepted them as experts; but I have come to the point where I do not accept them as experts, particularly when General Bradley makes a foreign-policy speech. I suggest to the Senator that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are absolutely under the control of the administration, and that their recommendations are what the administration demands that they make.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think that is a very serious charge which is made by the Senator from Ohio. I can think of nothing which is more likely to cause consternation in this country, to develop a fear which I believe the facts do not warrant, and generally to disrupt our effort in this great struggle with the Russians and with communism, than to state here that in effect he has no confidence in the integrity of the leading military figures in our Government. I think it is a very sad state in which we find ourselves if we are led to such extreme views.

It is a strange thing to me that only a short time ago, before General MacArthur appeared on the scene, by and large the country had faith in General Bradley, whom we all acknowledged to be a great military leader, one of the greatest in the last war. We had faith in General Eisenhower and in General Vandenberg. We had confidence in all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Suddenly those officers have become, in the eyes of the Senator from Ohio, merely political stooges of the President. I do not believe it, and I think it is a very dangerous doctrine to spread abroad in this country. If we lose faith in the integrity of our military men, in addition to the criticism which has been heaped upon the leadership in the political field, we certainly are in a sad state.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. TAFT. I shall ask only one question, or possibly two questions.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator read General Bradley's speech in Chicago the day before General MacArthur appeared at the Capitol?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read it as it was reported in the press.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that that was a foreign-policy speech, written, in effect, by the State Department for General Bradley? That is the thing which has shaken my confidence in the integrity of the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that General Bradley would lend himself to the expression of views to which he did not subscribe. I am quite willing to admit that in this case there is agreement on the part of General Bradley and

the Department of State. I see nothing wrong with that. I think it is quite fortunate that men of the caliber of General Bradley and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff find themselves in agreement with the political branch of our Government, specifically the Department of State and the President.

I do not wish to intimate to the Senator from Ohio that I do not like to debate with him. I do not want to say that I will not yield at any time, but I should prefer, if he does not mind, to make two or three points in this connection. If he has a question or observation, I shall be delighted to yield for that purpose, but I am just beginning to make this point.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for yielding.

The Senator referred to my position. I never have claimed to be a military expert, as the Senator suggests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio has been extremely positive in his views about military matters, not only in this connection, but in connection with the debate on the troops-to-Europe issue.

I listened to the Senator from Ohio then with great interest. If I correctly recall, I thought he evidenced confidence in his judgment on military matters, far beyond any confidence which I have in my judgment on such matters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that case, for example, on the question of troops to Europe, I was greatly persuaded by the opinion of General Eisenhower.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the questions I discussed in that speech were all questions of foreign policy. I assumed no knowledge of military questions whatever; but in that whole debate the questions discussed were of basic foreign policy of the United States and of economic policy, which places a limit upon our total military effort.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no clear-cut distinction between military and economic policy. Such a distinction has long since vanished from our life. They are too much interrelated to enable us to make such a distinction. But I felt that the Senator from Ohio had much more confidence in his opinion on the military matters involved in that debate than I have in my opinions on the military questions raised by General MacArthur's speech.

General MacArthur's views on the bombing of Red China, whether or not Red China bombs our bases in Korea and Japan, are opposed on military and political grounds not only by his own Government but also by the governments of the free world. Joining this group is L'Osservatore Romano, the newspaper published in the Vatican, which indicated that it did not think MacArthur's way was the way to peace. I do not know how much this article reflects the views of the Pope himself, but we all know that the Vatican is well informed on foreign affairs and it would be a little



wide of the mark to say that its newspaper is a Communist organ.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would it be just as wide of the mark to intimate that the newspaper published in the Vatican was subservient to the President of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so; either one.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator know that the publication referred to is not an official organ of the Vatican, and that the Vatican itself has so stated?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator was paying attention he would know that I did not state it was an official organ. I stated it was published at the Vatican. As I understand, it has columnists and writers, who are not necessarily speaking for the Pope. For the benefit of the Senator, I will repeat what I said. It was this:

"I do not know how much this article reflects the views of the Pope himself, but we all know that the Vatican is well informed on foreign affairs and it would be a little wide of the mark to say that its newspaper is a Communist organ."

I would say that I think it would be most unusual if anything directly contrary to what the Pope and the hierarchy believe on a matter of this importance appears in that newspaper.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that the Senator is not maintaining that it is an official organ of the Vatican.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I did not so state. But I say it appeared in that newspaper, and I say it would be most unusual if it was not in accord with the views of the hierarchy.

It may be, of course, that General MacArthur is right and the whole world is wrong. But, considering the gravity of the possible consequences if we should follow him, I shall go along with the majority in this case until there is a presentation of overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

There is no man in this Nation who does not share General MacArthur's desire to end the Korean war honorably, end our casualties there, and end the Chinese menace to our forces in the East. The quarrel is about the method. The General believes that the method is to bomb the enemy's supply bases in Manchuria, to blockade the Chinese coast, use Chiang Kai-shek's troops on the mainland and send large American reinforcements to Korea. This method raises certain questions in my mind.

Boldness and bravery are one thing. Recklessness and headlong dispatch are another. History teaches us that the fortunes of war are unpredictable; that war once begun no man can tell how far it will spread and in what directions. Hence, I ask:

"Is China our primary enemy, or is Russia our primary enemy?"

If knocking out China should involve us in large losses of men and material, would not this weaken us relative to Russia which up to date has not expended a single man in the wars since the end of the last world war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas, who is a very able member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and for whom Members on both sides of the aisle have great respect, what he really thinks will be the reaction in Europe if the United Nations forces in Korea should be defeated in the operation now going on? Does he not believe it would undermine the confidence of the European people in the collective-security system if communism is able to overwhelm the United Nations forces in Korea?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it would have a very great effect upon them; that it would undermine their confidence in the material and physical strength of this country and of the United Nations forces. It would be a terrible shock to all of them. On the other hand, I believe it would not adversely affect their respect for the moral position of ourselves and of the United Nations; but while, as I said, I am not a military expert, I do not expect such an eventuality as the Senator from California suggests.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is generally acknowledged that as of today the Soviet Union has the capability of delivering at least 50 atomic weapons if they are of the mind to do so. They have the equipment and they have the weapons. It is generally agreed that a year from now they will have almost double their present supply of weapons. Does the able Senator from Arkansas think we will be less able to withstand Communist blackmail a year or 2 years from now than we are today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator from California in the first place that I do not concede either of the assumptions. I know nothing of what the Russians have in the way of atomic bombs. Maybe the Senator from California does. But the facts with reference to those matters are very difficult to ascertain. I think the question is highly speculative, and I cannot give any opinion on it. I do not like to question the Senator's information, but I doubt whether the Senator is very sure of his information about how many bombs the Russians have or how they can deliver them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from California propounded a question as to the psychological reaction on the part of our allies if the United Nations forces in Korea were defeated and driven out of

Korea. Recognizing as I do the Senator's acknowledgment of lack of military expertness and joining him with a similar acknowledgment for myself, I ask him, even from that humble basis, militarily speaking, is it not apparent to the Senator from Arkansas that the United Nations forces in Korea have a far better chance of maintaining their position and preventing defeat and disaster so long as they limit their operation and their commitment to Korea, as compared to what their hopeless situation would be if they permitted themselves to become involved in a second front on the mainland of China, or if they deliberately provoked the division of their forces which would inevitably follow their opening up of a second front on the mainland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Oklahoma could not be more right in his views. I think what has led some people astray is that we do not have a very pleasant choice. I mean, we are in Korea, the conditions there are bad, and of course, we would all like to get out of our predicament. But what is being proposed to be done is worse, not better. If the Senator from California can contemplate the defeat of our forces under present conditions, how in the world can he avoid being positive that they would be defeated if they thin their ranks by extending themselves all over the Asiatic mainland?

Mr. KERR. Does not it have every aspect of inviting disaster, rather than of pursuing a program which to this date has been characterized by very substantial success?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to remind everyone who is concerned about this particular aspect of the problem that there is an analogy, I believe, between our present situation and the situation in Greece, during the recent troubles there. The two situations are not exactly the same, because in Greece we were not using our own troops in combat; we had a small mission there, but most of the casualties were Greeks. However, the relationship is somewhat the same, insofar as the so-called sanctuary is concerned. At that time we could very easily have become enraged at the part Yugoslavia was playing, for the Yugoslavs were giving sanctuary to the guerrillas who would cross the border and attack the forces of Greece, and then, when attacked in return, would run back across the border. That was a very frustrating experience; but finally those guerrillas got enough of it.

We could easily have extended the war, for example, by bombing Belgrade—which I think would have been the beginning of world war III, with Yugoslavia at that time of course aligned with Russia. But by pursuing what I think was a more cautious and a longer-term policy we succeeded in stopping that guerrilla warfare; and instead of having Yugoslavia entirely against us and in the arms of the Russians, Yugoslavia has now left the camp of the Russians and is in process of coming over to the western views. Our military men

think Yugoslavia is at least a source—I hesitate to say a source of strength to us, but certainly a source of weakness to the Russians, who thus have an exposed area there.

Mr. President, is it too much to hope that if we pursue the present policy in Korea, the Chinese might awaken to the fact that they are playing the Kremlin's game more than their own, and that after a sufficient amount of punishment the Chinese will become tired of losing such large numbers of men? I cannot subscribe to the theory that Chinese like to die any more than Americans or other peoples do. Perhaps the Chinese do not have as much control over their destiny as others do. However, I believe the matter might be worked out in that way; and at least we have a precedent which is very encouraging to the west.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Arkansas is not trying to leave the impression that the United States fought a war in Greece, is he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A moment ago I stated that the big difference between the situation in Korea and that in Greece is that in the latter case the troops were Greeks, but the management or direction happened to be the same as that in Korea today. In other words, the general who now is in charge of the war in Korea, General Van Fleet, was formerly in charge in Greece. By accident, I was in Athens—I was not there inspecting the military mission—at the time when General Van Fleet was there. He and a score of other very intelligent and able American military men—I forget the exact number—were actually directing that war. They organized the war. There is a very major difference, of course, between the war in Greece and the war in Korea, in that in the former case the casualties were Greeks, whereas in the case of Korea the casualties are very largely Americans.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, the action in Greece was not a war, or at least we took no active part in it. We had possibly 100 advisers there, but they never fired a gun; they had nothing to do with that war or action, except to advise the Greek Government. If it was so successful, as the able Senator from Arkansas would like to have all of us believe, why did not the President of the United States use the same methods in Korea?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In this respect we are using the same methods in Korea, and that is the point which now is at controversy. The main point we are discussing is whether we should extend the war, whether we should invade, we might say, the sanctuary of the Communists. In that respect, there is a great similarity between the war in Greece and the war in Korea. One of the very aggravating aspects of the Greek war was the fact that the Greeks who were under our direction were unable to invade the sanctuary in that case, which at that time was Yugoslavia. That is the only point I am making now, namely, that there is an analogy in that respect. It

would have been very helpful temporarily, and would have saved lives, if at that time we could have bombed the bases from which the guerrillas were infiltrating and moving back and forth across the Greek border.

Mr. CAPEHART. Whose lives would have been saved?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that certainly all of us, feel very badly about the casualties we are suffering in Korea; and they are terrible to contemplate; but it seems to me we should not let them blind us, and lead us into abandoning a policy which in the long run would cause us to have far fewer casualties, rather than more casualties. That is the problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for one more question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator from Arkansas willing to leave the impression that we participated in a war in Greece and had soldiers there who fired guns and killed other people?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure whether any Americans who were there fired guns. I am sure the whole effort was under the direction of American military men, and that General Van Fleet was the main boss of it. He had a number of colonels and brigadiers there, whom I met; and they were actually winning the war. Whether some of them fired guns, I am not personally aware. However, I do not believe that has anything to do with this matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arkansas, with his characteristic logic, has made an excellent analysis of the possibilities of extending the war, by referring to the situation existing in the Greek area and also the situation in the Asiatic area. Is it not true that the war in Greece, to which the Senator has alluded, was a civil war among the Greek people themselves, a war within their own country? In other words, at least it was ostensibly a case in which a nation was at war with itself, although obviously with outside help. On the other hand the battle in Korea is between one nation state and another nation state. Is there not that difference, insofar as the point to which the Senator from Indiana has been referring?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the two are not exactly on all fours. My only point was with reference to the question of what might happen to the sanctuary, and whether in the long run it would be wise to attack the bases there, thus solving, let us say, the immediate problem, but also bringing on a much worse one. That case seemed to me to be somewhat similar, in that it would have helped the immediate situation, but also would have resulted in a conflagration in that entire area.

I think a little of that aspect of the problem was involved in the Berlin airlift. In that case the first mistake—which I shall not go into now—was the original agreement. However, I shall not discuss that question now. On the

other hand, once we were in that situation, of course we could have used armed forces in an effort to reach a solution, and that might or might not have precipitated a war. At the least, however, it would have involved that risk. In any case, we exercised great self-restraint, and we got past that particular emergency without having it break into a war.

So I believe that fundamentally all these questions must be answered on the basis of one's evaluation of whether a war is inevitable. If we believe that in spite of everything which can be done we must have a war with Russia, then we can reach an entirely different line of questions.

However, my entire argument is based on the theory that it is possible—although we may not be wise enough to achieve it—to avoid an all-out war with Russia. The Senator was not here at the beginning of my remarks, when I read an excerpt from a statement by Winston Churchill, whom I regard as a very great statesman, particularly with reference to political and military matters relating to war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also the intention of the Senator from Arkansas that if that war is to be extended or expanded—in other words, if we are to engage in hostilities on the Asiatic mainland or anywhere else—that should not occur as the result of direct action by us, but rather, should occur as a result of offensive action by the ultimate enemy, namely, Soviet Russia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes; absolutely so. I desire to make it clear that I am not merely saying that we should tie our hands behind our backs indefinitely, and that, if the enemy wishes to extend the war, we shall not retaliate. I am saying that we should not extend it by our voluntary and affirmative action. We must, of course, recognize that it is possible that that will be done by others, but that is true of anything in life; however, we should not adopt such a course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would that not be the case, for example, up to the present time? We have not bombed the Manchurian air bases.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have not done so, primarily because it has not been necessary militarily, due to the fact that neither the North Koreans nor the Chinese have had a great air armada. Is not that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, if the North Koreans and Chinese persist in the offensive, if the sky should be filled with waves of bombers and planes supplied by the Soviet to the Chinese Communists, then as a matter of defense, even though we have tried to limit the war, we should be compelled as a matter of defense to strike back, is not that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. Yes, certainly I would say that. In the same way, supposing that the Russians were to unloose a submarine attack tomorrow on our transports. I should then consider that they had very definitely extended the war; that is, if we wish to carry out that line of thought.



But, judging the matter as it is now operating, and as it has been operating until now, both sides seem to have accepted the principle of limiting the war to this area. The Communists have not bombed Japan, they have not used submarines, they have used very few military planes. They have used a few fighters which have come over but which have done very little damage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am wondering whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that there is a very great difference between the situation in Greece and the situation in Korea. Greece, as the Senator must know, received a United States military mission amounting to approximately 1,000 advisers. True, they were on a battalion level, and perhaps on a regimental level, but they were advisory. In Korea, we alone have approximately 250,000 American Armed Forces. We have sustained 60,000 casualties, and, of those 60,000 casualties, we have had over 10,000 killed; so that in the number of killed alone, we have had 10 times as many as the entire mission which was sent to Greece as advisers to the Greek forces.

The only point I wish to make here—and I am very much interested in the Senators' discussion—is that our Army must not be jeopardized. It is hard for me to understand the reasoning that allows Communist tanks, guns, and ammunition to come in from north of the Yalu River when these war supplies are used to kill American and United Nations forces, while the State Department and the United Nations tell our fighting men that we cannot strike at the Manchurian bases from which those tanks and guns and arms are coming, and then to have them state that in the event planes come over in force we may then, when perhaps too late, strike at their bases.

I merely point out what General Stratemeyer said recently, that if the planes, which we know today are in Manchuria, have an opportunity to surprise the American Air Force, they may render us an almost fatal blow, and by that time they may have so changed the strategic situation in Korea that we shall jeopardize our entire force which is there. I very much question the wisdom of risking the lives of 250,000 American troops, to say nothing of the troops of our allies, under those conditions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since I disclaimed, when I started, any military knowledge, I do not wish to argue with the Senator about a purely military matter, which I regard this as being. I refer to the question of what the Communist air force now in Manchuria could do to our own forces. On that kind of matter, I think our military people are best qualified to judge. If it were their policy that in order to prevent destruction of our Army as a result of a major disaster, bases in Manchuria had to be bombed, I should not argue about it; but I do not understand that to be their decision, and, that being so, I can see grave disadvantages in bringing on an extension of the war.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a moment, that I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from California has given the figure of 250,000, a quarter of a million, American fighting men in Korea, and he gives the sad intelligence that we have had 10,000 killed. Based upon that fundamental statement, what is the total number of troops of all the members of the United Nations who are now in Korea fighting with our 250,000 men? What have the other nations contributed in numbers?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that the approximate figure as to men furnished by all the other members of the United Nations members—and, as the Senator will understand, the Republic of Korea is not a member of the United Nations—

Mr. TOBEY. I understand that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that the number of soldiers contributed by all the other members of the United Nations put together would not exceed half of what our casualties alone are in Korea—in other words, in the neighborhood of 30,000.

Mr. TOBEY. And we have in the field 250,000 men, 8 times that number.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. And we have lost 10,000 boys by death. How many have they lost by death?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have those figures at my fingertips, but I think it is in the neighborhood of 1,000.

Mr. TOBEY. One thousand. That is 10 percent; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. The point I make—and I make it in no spirit of criticism or of caustic comment—is that we are told this is a United Nations war in Korea, and that we, the United States, constitute the major part of the United Nations force. Always in the back of my mind is the question—and I am not clear on the point—whether, when the war is ended in Korea, it will really be considered that it was a United Nations war or a United States war. Based on the figures of death and numbers, I am forced to believe that, regardless of the title of the war, we are bearing the great bulk of the contest in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that there is no question about that. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield for a little debate on the part of other Senators. When I shall have concluded I shall be perfectly willing for the Senator from New Hampshire to debate with the Senator from California.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas it is a question which is in the minds of all

Senators. I think the Senator from California made a correct statement of what had been in my mind. I believe we are all entitled to know the facts in the case. At least, I am desirous of knowing the facts. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that many of us feel that we are suffering casualties in Korea out of all proportion to the total membership of the United Nations. However, I think that issue is beside the point which is particularly under discussion at this time, which is a matter of policy, and of an effort to limit our own losses. If one is thinking primarily of casualties, I cannot imagine how he would wish to extend the war. It is bad enough that 10,000 American soldiers have been killed in a limited war in Korea; but I am unable to see how anyone who feels so strongly about our casualties can think it would help matters to extend the war over Asia. It interests me very much to prevent this from becoming a world-wide conflagration, in which 10,000 casualties would seem as nothing, for we would be suffering that many casualties perhaps daily, or certainly weekly. That is why it seems so strange to me that such an argument should be advanced, and it is certainly the sad part of this whole business, that it can be used to justify the extension of a limited war into a world-wide war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was impressed by what General MacArthur had to say as to the importance of maintaining the perimeter of defense. He cited, very graphically and very pointedly, the importance of maintaining Formosa. Needless to say, we have an obligation in Japan. Further, Korea is close to Japan. So it appears to me that one of our reasons for having large forces in Korea is not merely to stop Communist aggression there but it is because, as General MacArthur has said, Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and the line all the way down into southern Asia is part of the defense of the United States of America. So let us make it clear that our action in Korea is vital to our own defense. General MacArthur says that this perimeter of defense is vital to the security of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is entirely correct, and I appreciate that contribution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator aware of the high-sounding reasons given for the action in Korea as being in the interest of the United Nations by way of affording protection to the free nations of the world against aggression? It is not, so far as the administration

tells us, for the protection of the United States, but in the interest of the United Nations as a protection against aggression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those two things are not mutually exclusive. I think it is quite possible—in fact, I believe it is true—that they are one and the same thing. In the long run, the strengthening and protection of the United Nations is the strengthening and protection of the United States. To put it the other way, I think that anything which is good for the strengthening of the United States is good for the United Nations. There is a very great degree of similarity or identity of interests in this question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to make a few more points, but I yield briefly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There may be similarity of interest in many fields in the Korean action, but not a similarity of sacrifice. The United States is doing the sacrificing. American boys are doing the sacrificing. The United Nations is bowing out and letting us do this dirty job, and is not giving us the support which it should contribute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator on that point. I think, with a very few exceptions, the other nations have taken their responsibility very casually.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator will tell us who is doing the sacrificing in Indochina, where 150,000 French troops have suffered 37,000 casualties. It is a war against the same communism, against imperialistic, aggressive communism, and the loss of Indochina could be as serious as the loss of Korea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From a material standpoint I think the loss of southeast Asia probably would be much worse than would be the loss of Korea. Tin, rubber, and oil are produced there, and they are valuable to Russia. It is a very vital area. I understand the British have quite a substantial force in Malaya.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They have 175,000 troops there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not desire to become diverted into an argument. I suppose we could go back and calculate the casualties in the Second World War, but it seems to me that is not a point that is very pertinent to the question we are trying to solve in this debate regarding General MacArthur's policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The reason I brought up the subject of Malaya and Indochina is because I was deeply moved by General MacArthur's statement. He said there was a global threat, and that we must be prepared to fight on two fronts. If the general is correct in

saying that the Communist threat is global, then when the British are fighting in Malaya, the French are fighting in Indochina and are guarding North Africa, and the British are guarding the Suez, these, our allies, are making great contributions in the struggle against communism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator is absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. With reference to the production of tin, rubber, and oil, referred to a moment ago, will the Senator from Arkansas comment on the reports that one of the principal reasons the British are in Malaya is to obtain tin and rubber? Does the Senator have any solution of the problem, which is definitely one of the most serious problems which our fighting forces in Korea have to face, namely, preventing the British or any other nation from constantly supplying strategic materials to the Russians?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been told by very responsible officials of the British Embassy that Great Britain is not doing what the Senator has stated. I have been told that they are not supplying tin or rubber to the Communists.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator any comment to make on the report that the British are supplying at least six engines to the Russians?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood that happened some time ago, at the time we were sending machine tools and all sorts of things to Russia. We carried on trade with Russia until recently, as the Senator well knows. It has been only within the past year that it has been practically cut off. We were receiving from Russia manganese, which is very important to us.

Mr. AIKEN. It is common knowledge—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Charges of this kind should not be a matter of common knowledge. They should be very specific and official and not mere gossip. As the Senator from Vermont well knows, there is in this country a great newspaper empire which specializes in rumors regarding Great Britain. It has been going on for 50 years. It would be thought they were at the height of their power in the days of good Queen Bess. That is a lot of nonsense. I do not know the facts. If the Senator did not read the stories in the Chicago Tribune—if that is not his authority—but read them elsewhere, we might well look into the question. I do not know that Great Britain is sending tin and rubber to the Communists. We can read such statements every day in the McCormick press, but I am a little suspicious of what is stated there.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont does not read the Chicago Tribune any more than does the Senator from Arkansas. But I think it is common knowledge that Great Britain is carrying on trade with Communist China at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. She is carrying on trade; yes. There is what we under-

stand as normal trade between Hong Kong and China, but I understood the Senator to say that Great Britain was protecting Malaya in order to produce tin and rubber to supply the Communists in China and Russia. I say I do not know that that is a fact.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer the Senator from Arkansas to the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor], who has repeatedly invited the attention of the Senate to the conditions which exist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They did exist. Whether or not they still exist, I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Maryland spoke this morning on that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to cut off debate, but that is a question about which I have made no research. I should like to get through with my statement.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to yield for a question on that subject.

Mr. KEM. Is it not on that subject. I think it is pertinent to what the Senator from Arkansas stated in his very excellent statement. It is reported in one of the Washington newspapers this morning that the President is about to remove Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State. In that event, no Senator would be obliged to depend for facts upon Mr. Acheson. Can the Senator from Arkansas give the Senate and the people of the United States any ray of hope in that respect?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think I quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KEM. Let me repeat my question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Missouri is just as close to the present occupant of the White House, so far as knowing what his plans are, as is the Senator from Arkansas. But I am in no position to answer any such question. I have not been consulted and I do not know what is going to be done with regard to the Secretary of State.

Mr. KEM. I wanted to be sure that the Senator from Arkansas understood my question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not for a question on irrelevant matters.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my view, at least, it is very relevant to the discussion of a moment ago. As the Senator well knows, the British have recognized Communist China, and have sent an Ambassador there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. China has not yet recognized the British Government, but I take it they are willing to do business with them, diplomatically and in every other way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I do not think it is a pertinent question. However, since he has raised it, I may suggest that I am not defending what the British have done. They have done a great many things which I think are erroneous, both in foreign policy and domestic policy. I do not approve of many of the things they have done, among



them some the Senator has mentioned. However, it has no bearing on what I am discussing today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to proceed with my speech.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I think it would be unfair not to take note of the fact, although many of us would like to get more help from the British, that as of 5 weeks ago they had sent to Korea 16,573 men, who are now fighting there. They are fighting alongside American troops. So far as I know, the British have been cooperating to some degree in the economic blockade of China, and our Government is doing everything it can to get the full cooperation of the British for a complete economic blockade of China.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator knows that many of the things of which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'Connor] has been complaining have been carried on by Americans. Many of the ships involved have been American, disguised by the Panamanian flag. We will always have chiselers who will do such things. As I understand, it is certainly not the official policy of the British. I think I know perhaps as much about it as do some of the other Senators. All of this is rather vague, and it is not part of the British policy to carry on any such contraband, official, or legal trade in war material.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield for one more question. Then I wish to proceed with my speech. None of the questions have had any bearing on my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think what I have to say has some bearing on the Senator's remarks. I wonder whether the Senator has noticed that in a certain part of the Senate Chamber there seems to be an unquestioning loyalty, affection and regard for the forces of Chiang Kai-shek, and for Chiang Kai-shek himself. This same generalissimo only recently, was forced to retreat from China and yield to the Communist forces. There seems to be a continuous harassment, embarrassment, and attack upon one great ally that this country has, on whom we can count and depend, and who in the most recent war gave an heroic account of itself. I speak of Great Britain. I ask the Senator how we can expect to have any friends, how we can expect to maintain any allies, how we can expect to have a spirit of cooperation and full participation when a good share of the United States Senate spends its time tearing down, abusing, and misrepresenting one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth? I refer to our one great ally, Great Britain. She may be a little tired, and the old lion may not have too much roar in her, but she is still the best ally we have. In comparison with Chiang Kai-shek, Great Britain is a giant, a fortress of

strength. I think we ought to honor the ally we do have.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I have a much higher opinion of the British than the Senator from Minnesota has of them. However, does the Senator think that we should always agree with them in every case, as when they demanded that we give up Formosa, on the very day General MacArthur spoke before Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator asking me the question?

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator believe that we should accede to every request the British make of us?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly I do not think so. They have done many things with which I have not agreed, particularly in recent years, both in domestic policy and in foreign policy. From what I can judge, a very important part of the present British Government, made up of some elements of the Labor Party, does not agree with anything we are doing. They do not want to rearm. They do not want to go along with us. I do not see that that has any particular significance to the question under discussion. I realize that it was not very long ago that we fought the war of 1812 with them, but I think it is time that we got over our attitude toward the British and tried to evaluate on an objective basis what they think and what they do.

Mr. President, I do not wish to cut off debate, but I would like to complete my prepared remarks.

Who is prepared to say how much the conquest of China might cost us?

Who can tell us how effective bombings may be against a primitive economy such as China's where there are few large factories and thousands of small, scattered handicraft industries?

We can perhaps learn something by reexamining the experience of Japan during 12 years of bombing China. If, however, we conclude that we could knock China out of the war with little loss to ourselves, we would then merely go on to the next question which is even more difficult to answer.

In war, as in life generally, prudent men want to pay a price commensurate with the gain; to weigh the benefits against the risks. General MacArthur seems to believe that if we use his method against China, Russia will not intervene. How does he know this? With what accuracy can he read the minds of the men who direct the destinies of Russia? If we should attack China proper, to what extent would Russia feel obliged to intervene under the terms of the Sino-Russia treaty? Does General MacArthur know what the secret agreements may be between the two countries? How far would Russian prestige in the Orient be dissipated if she should stand idly by and see knocked to pieces her Chinese ally? And if Russia intervened, would we not then, while precipitating the third world war doom our far-eastern forces to destruction, lose Japan,

and lay all of southeast Asia open to easy invasion?

If, I ask, we have had to struggle hard to meet even the limited requirements of the Korean War, are we now prepared for the unlimited requirements of the third world war? Have we sufficient planes? Have we enough guns and ammunition? How far along is our guided-missiles project? What is the state of our merchant marine and Navy, especially with respect to antisubmarine devices and submarine-killer ships? What is the state of our civilian defense against Russian A-bomb attacks? What right have we to assume that the Russian bombers will not get through to us when our own Air Force people tell us point blank that many of them will get through to us, just as many of our bombers will get through to the Russians? Where are the meager four divisions that we have promised to send Europe? Are they ready? Are they equipped? Going beyond this, are our Allies ready? Are they equipped? Winston Churchill has it that if you must fight a war, you ought to fight it, if possible, at the most favorable moment. Let us ask ourselves: Is today or tomorrow the most favorable moment for the United States and its allies? Does the risk in this case equal the possible gains?

I was deeply disturbed—to come to another question—by an extraordinary omission in General MacArthur's speech. The United States is one of the founders of the United Nations and its most powerful member while the general himself was the first commander in history of a United Nations force. Yet, never once did he mention the United Nations or the brave men, few though they may be, who are now fighting alongside our troops in Korea. Is this organization dead? If it is not dead, shall we make over-all strategy, involving the life or death of millions of people, without consulting our allies? Shall we commit them to a world war without their consent? Do we prefer to face Russia alone? Shall we make a war with Russia an all-American war?

Shall we, by our impetuosity, cause our allies to fall away from us, until disheartened and hopeless, they make the best deal they can with Russia and become our active or passive enemies?

We all know how difficult it is to hold together a coalition composed as it is of nations with differing interests and points of views. Do we believe that we can cement this shaky structure of the United Nations by cavalierly disregarding the opinions of those who compose it outside ourselves? Shall we gain Chiang Kai-shek and lose Britain, France, Italy, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, Greece, and Turkey? General MacArthur desires that the United States maintain a global policy. Shall we maintain it through that rather small part of the globe that the United States covers? If we are to have a global policy, how shall we conduct it effectively without the invaluable air bases of France, Britain, north Africa, and other places around the globe that we neither own nor control? How shall we protect the sea approaches to the United States without

bases in Greenland, Iceland, and the Azores; territories that are not American real estate?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, in answer to his question, that if his military ability and prowess were as good as the China lobby and Chiang's lobby, he would be a terrific ally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Remember, as we ponder these questions, that every Government in the free world is opposed to General MacArthur's views on the solution of the Chinese war. He may be right, but so far he has not convinced our allies, much less a united America, that he is right. He may be right, I repeat, but if we should presently adopt his view concerning the bombing of Red China, we must bear in mind the following possible eventualities:

(a) Russia may not intervene directly. She may simply stand by, aiding the Chinese, until we have suffered grievous losses in beating them down. Then, while we are committed heavily in the east, she may wheel and turn upon an almost defenseless west. Successful in Europe, she would have 270,000,000 slaves of the highest technical skill and the vast productive machinery of that area. We might destroy some of it by bombing Europe; that is, by killing our friends in incomprehensible numbers.

(b) Russia might intervene directly, thereby precipitating the third world war. Is this, I ask you, a favorable moment for us and our allies?

(c) If we accept General MacArthur's method, we must face certain eventualities with respect to our allies.

First. They may disassociate themselves from our policy, leaving us to follow it alone.

Second. We may drag them into a world war, against their will and without their consent, and only as the lesser of two evils.

The struggle with Russia, under the best of circumstances, would, if it should come, be desperate enough. Do we want to face it with resentful, reluctant allies, or with allies who see eye to eye with us, one in resolve, one in faith, one in purpose?

So far, I have said nothing of the possible effects of General MacArthur's proposal upon the non-Communist Orient. It joins with Western Europe in its opposition to the general's China policy. It is something less than enthusiastic about Chiang Kai-shek, and something less than delighted with the western white world generally. The general said, quite rightly, that the Orient is in rebellion against colonialism. But if we should start bombing China and invading it with our troops, or Chinese Nationalist troops landed on the Chinese mainland by our Air Force and Navy, might not the Orient then regard us, a mighty power, as the most dangerous exponent of colonialism that has ever appeared in Asia? Why should we expect orientals to believe in our good intentions as we believe in them? What

could we do to reassure them that once in China, we shall not always be in China? What risks do we run here of alienating India, the great non-Communist power of the East? How would we fare, attacking China, among all the peoples of the East who have no reason to love white men? Shall we pursue a policy that, aside from the enormous risks inherent in it of provoking the third world war, is certain to set strongly against us nearly the whole of the free world? Are we prepared, are we ready in our hearts, souls, and minds, to back General MacArthur's proposal against the weight of most of the earth?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I understood the able Senator from Arkansas to say that all the nations of the free world were opposed to General MacArthur's plan to bomb the lines of communication behind the enemy lines in Korea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my impression.

Mr. KEM. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas has seen the Associated Press dispatch from Lake Success which appears in the Washington Evening Star of today, and which reads in part as follows—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that I have not seen it, because I have been on the floor so long that I have lost touch with what is going on. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. I invite the Senator's attention to this statement in the dispatch:

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., April 26.—The United States has proposed the bombing of enemy bases in Manchuria, if the Communists launch heavy air attacks on United Nations forces in Korea.

A United States spokesman said the recommendation had been outlined to 13 other countries with military forces fighting for the UN in Korea and that no objections had been raised.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator had been present a moment ago, he would recall that we discussed the eventuality of an all-out air attack being launched against us. That is the basis for that press report. I agree, as I think other Senators do, that that would change the situation very substantially. The point at issue is whether, under conditions as they now exist, that is, without any all-out air attack by Russia or any other major change in the situation in that regard, we should precipitate the attack. That is what we were talking about.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that so long as the number of casualties remains as at present, between 1,400 and 2,000 American boys a week, and does not increase, he is not willing that we take the steps suggested?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I did not say that at all. I do not know where the Senator got that idea. That is not the deciding question in the point which I have been trying to make. I did say that I do not understand why the Sen-

ator, who is concerned—and rightly, as we all are—over the casualties, would be willing to extend the war, unless under very grave provocation. If the war were extended, instead of 1,000 or 2,000 casualties a week, there quite likely would be 10,000 a week. I do not follow the Senator's reasoning at all.

Mr. KEM. The Senator assumes a fact which is not at all proved, and that is that the steps suggested would extend the war. So far as I know, General MacArthur did not propose to extend the war. The extension of the war is a figment of the imagination of Senators on the other side and spokesmen in the State Department. No one wants to extend the war, but every right-minded American, so far as I know, wants to protect the American boys at the front. To continue a situation in which they are shot at like sitting ducks seems to me to be unthinkable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to go back over that ground. I pointed out in the beginning that the real difference is one of method. There is no difference between the objective of Senators on the other side of the aisle and the objective of Senators on this side of the aisle, or that of General MacArthur. We all want to get out of this war with the least possible number of casualties. We do not want to enter into an extended war. Where we differ is as to what is likely to happen if we follow General MacArthur's suggestions. There is a very grave difference of opinion on that matter. I agree with the Senator that what we seek is the same thing, but we do disagree as to the best and most efficient way to achieve that purpose.

Mr. KEM. It seems to me that while the Senator is talking about defending the Acheson policies on the floor, the United Nations are leaving them and adopting the MacArthur policies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what justification the Senator has for denominating what has been the official policy supported by our Government and others as the Acheson policy. It seems to me that I read in the press not too long ago that Secretary Acheson had held views about the same as those of General MacArthur. I should like to say here that I think it is a rather bad habit that we have fallen into, of personalizing these policies. I do not wish to keep referring to a policy as someone's policy. These should be objective matters in which we are all seeking to find the policy which is most to the advantage of the United States and of the United Nations. I do not care whose policy it was or who thought of it. What I hope is that we can throw some light on the policy itself.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator completely that this is not a question of personalities, but of policies. But the policies are designated with the names of their originators.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator have any persuasive and final proof that the policy we are following is that of the Secretary of State, and his alone? I do not think the Senator has. I have no idea how it was finally agreed upon. It is a very complicated matter.



Mr. KEM. It is generally understood that the recall of General MacArthur was evidence of the complete domination of Dean Acheson over the foreign policy and military commitments of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is correct in saying it is generally understood. It has been generally stated by certain newspapers. I have no knowledge about that matter, and I do not propose to continue a debate on that subject. I do not know anything about it. All I know is that he was dismissed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the matter that was raised by the Senator from Missouri, and which I think the Senator from Arkansas correctly pointed out should not be personalized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the Senator from Arkansas that no one I know of, from the President of the United States and the Joint Chiefs of Staff down, who has upheld, shall we call it, the present governmental policy in Korea, has proposed that, if the enemy cuts loose with airplanes and submarines, the security of our forces will not demand suitable retribution. But then we have said that means world war III.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. McMAHON. And if it is going to start, let them start it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely right.

Mr. McMAHON. MacArthur wants to start it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not presume there is any disagreement about that. I do not know of anyone on this side of the aisle or anywhere else who does not recognize that if the Russians chose to they could start world war III, and we would certainly respond. They have an opportunity every day to start it. They could have started it at the time of the Berlin airlift. But they did not do it. I am hopeful that we have sense enough not to do it now. And I hope we will not start it. That is the whole point.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I am happy—I say that first and then I will finish the question—I am happy that the Senator has mentioned the Berlin airlift, and he might have made reference to what we did in Greece and Turkey, because there were impetuous spirits then who said that the thing for us to do was to bring the matter to a final conclusion. I ask the Senator if that is not true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. And bring on the war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. But we were steadfast and patient, and did we not work the problem out?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut? I will take not more than a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have only two more pages of my prepared remarks left, and I should really like to finish. If the Senator will make his interruption short, I will yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will make it short. There is a great difference between the situation mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut and the situation now, and certainly the Senator from Connecticut should be the first to realize it. At the time of the Berlin airlift, and at the time of the Greco-Turkish aid program, we were acting under the assumption that the Soviet Union would not have the atomic weapon for at least another 3 or 4 years. Now we know that they have had it since September of 1949. We are now in a different age than that of even so short a time ago as the time of the Berlin airlift or the time of the Greco-Turkish aid program.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me to make a brief answer to that statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from California has, I think, made an argument for pursuing the policy of steadfastness and patience even better than I have, because I recollect that he voted the other day against even to setting up regional headquarters dispersed 20 miles from Washington, although the Russians are now stockpiling atomic weapons.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from California will agree with me that he has digressed into a matter which is not contained in my speech. I should like to finish, and then we can continue with what the Senator proposes to mention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of personal privilege, I should appreciate the Senator's yielding, since the Senator from Connecticut has mentioned my name. I promise the Senator from Arkansas it will not take more than half a minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I think I have been as alert as he has to the dangers the world and this country have been facing and are facing at the present time. I have participated in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee in the effort to obtain some funds for civil defense that will apply to the 150,000,000 people of America, and not to Washington alone.

Mr. McMAHON. I congratulate the Senator, I congratulate him pro tanto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am sadly aware of the fact that I have raised more questions than I have answered. If my colleagues can answer them, they will have a most respectful hearing on my part. Dogmatism is wrong at any time. But it is downright dangerous when applied to the great is-

suues of life or death that confront us. Yet we must find the answers to our questions, and I do not doubt that we shall find them. Of all the wisdom that went into making this country there must survive a residue by which it can be saved. But, I suggest, we must search for the truth quietly, calmly, carefully, after hearing anybody who can help us and weighing the evidence as best we can. The military and the civilian authority both make mistakes and it is inevitable that they should since they are fallible men. We may make more mistakes but if we do, let us not compound the error by making them through stubbornness, prejudice, or partisanship. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts and the United States is greater than you or me or President Truman or General MacArthur.

Here let me say a personal word. My paths have never crossed those of General MacArthur. And as you know, they have seldom crossed those of President Truman. For a long time we have been walking on opposite sides of the street, neither of us nodding to the other. He has often thought me wrong and unspeakable, while I have sometimes thought him wrong and incomprehensible. I retain the right to agree or disagree with him as the case may be. But I do have a real sympathy for him in the awful responsibility which he alone must carry.

I do not know what the verdict of history upon Mr. Truman will be. His contemporaries, such being the frailty of human nature, are more likely to exaggerate his faults than to enumerate his virtues, while he, as most men, has a full quota of both. I am not in his good graces. I have spoken with him on official business only once in several years. This, however, does not blind me to the fact that he has made decisions on a number of occasions that equal in imagination, courage, and effectiveness any ever taken by an American President. Nearly all of these decisions are without precedent in our history. Some of them are—

The dropping of the A-bomb on Japan.  
Aid to Greece and Turkey.

The Marshall plan.

The Berlin airlift.

The North Atlantic Treaty.

The sending of divisions of American troops to Europe in peacetime; troops under the command of General Eisenhower.

The going into Korea, a decision that at the time had the approbation of the Nation and of nearly the whole of the free world.

No one can doubt that, in the absence of some of these stupendous decisions, much of the present free world would now be lost to us and our struggle against Russia would be the more difficult.

These momentous decisions are the President's responsibility, taken though most of them were with the advice and consent of the Congress and the people and the approbation of the military. Mr. Truman remains the President and in these terrible times, I submit that it

is necessary for us to keep him in perspective. Let us not permit his occasional lapses of speech or temperament or his misguided loyalty to unworthy friends to endanger a calm and objective judgment on the present controversy.

#### AIR SUPPORT FOR WESTERN EUROPEAN DEFENSES

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, some time ago when the troops-for-Europe resolution was under discussion in the Senate, an amendment was offered, asking that the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that in their opinion there was adequate air cover for four American ground divisions before they were sent to Europe. Yesterday I noticed in the Washington Evening Star a very interesting article entitled "Western Europe's Defenses Now Have Meager Air Support." The article is by Maj. George Fielding Elliot, who, after discussing the situation in considerable detail, summarizes his findings as follows:

But this doesn't remove the grim fact that there just won't be enough tactical air power in Western Europe during 1951-52, barring some such stroke of luck as a sudden satisfactory ending of the Korean war which would permit the United States to switch all its tactical air power and navy and marine aviation from that theater to Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the entire article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WESTERN EUROPE'S DEFENSES NOW HAVE MEAGER AIR SUPPORT

(By George Fielding Elliot)

Air power for the defense of Western Europe may be considered in three categories: (1) Strategic; (2) tactical; (3) air defense.

Strategic air power contributes to European security indirectly, by reducing the enemy's offensive capabilities. Strategic air will at first be almost wholly a United States responsibility. Details lie outside the scope of this article.

Tactical air power has three major tasks: (1) To establish air superiority—in GI language, "keeping the so-and-sos off our necks"; (2) Isolation of the battlefield—preventing the enemy from bringing up supplies and reinforcements and smashing his depots and rear-area establishments; (3) direct combat support to ground troops. It's a fair rule-of-thumb that, for all these purposes, there should be about one air group—fighters or fighter-bombers—for each division of ground troops in a given theater of operations, plus a due proportion of light bombers and night fighters.

#### SHORT ON TACTICAL POWER

Air defense, in the strict application of the term is defense of home territory from hostile air attack, as distinguished from tactical air operations in the combat zone. But in Europe, the home territory of some countries of the North Atlantic Alliance may be close to or actually in the combat zone; hence this distinction is not a fine one.

Under present plans there is little prospect of having enough tactical air power to support the prospective number of ground troops in Western Europe's defense forces either this year or next year. This deficiency is made worse by two additional factors: (1) Since inferiority in numbers on the ground is certain, this should be made up for by extra tactical air power, but, in fact,

there will be a shortage instead. (2) There will be an inescapable tendency for governments concerned to drain off tactical air power for home defense.

Here is how the situation breaks down by countries:

United States Air Forces, Europe (USAFE) and the British Air Forces of Occupation (BAFO) will have, by the end of 1951, sufficient tactical air power in Europe to provide minimum support for the American and British divisions which then will be under General Eisenhower's command. This will be supplemented in the light and medium bomber field by Bomber Command, RAF, based in Great Britain. But the rest of the Allied forces will be in no such fortunate condition.

#### FRENCH START FROM SCRATCH

The French Air Force is starting virtually from scratch, and, with all the spirit and good will in the world, it will be lucky to be able to put two tactical groups into the air by the end of this year to support its 10 divisions. Its remaining units will be chiefly useful for air defense.

The Belgian and Dutch Air Forces may, by that time, have one tactical group each. The Italian Air Force is restricted by treaty to 200 combat-type planes, which it is getting this year—but they are F-47's and F-51's, not jets. The net deficiency in tactical air power on the main front (Switzerland to the North Sea) will be about 10-12 groups at the end of 1951.

By the end of 1952, as the ground forces will increase more rapidly than the air forces (in the nature of things—can't be helped) the net deficiency of tactical air power will be of the order of 15-20 groups. After that, as European aircraft production begins to become significant and our own production and Britain's gets into stride on newer models, the tactical air situation will improve rapidly. This year and next are the danger periods from the tactical air point of view.

#### ONLY TWO SOURCES NOW

There are only two sources from which this deficiency can be made up, as prospects now appear. One is from United States and British naval aviation; the other is the home defense force (Fighter Command) of the RAF.

It would be a serious matter to tie down so highly mobile a weapon as carrier-borne naval aviation to a fixed commitment within a restricted area. By so doing we would, of course, deprive ourselves of all the advantages which mobility and surprise could give us against a comparatively slow-moving foe, all round the perimeter of the vast Soviet Empire. Yet it may be necessary to forego these advantages in the interest of sheer survival.

As for Fighter Command, no British Government in possession of its senses can be expected to fritter away the ultimate defense force of the island of Great Britain in a fight of uncertain outcome. The British were almost overwhelmed in the last war by taking long chances with their fighter defenses. It is probable that very few squadrons of Fighter Command would be made available for air warfare over the Continent unless and until the struggle for air superiority had already been won, or was so nearly won, that it was clear that the intervention of Fighter Command would be decisive of the issue.

#### AIR SWITCH NECESSARY

This is sound military sense from the Allied viewpoint, too, since the security of the British island as a base of operations and a source of industries (including aircraft) production is essential to the security of Western Europe as a whole.

But this doesn't remove the grim fact that there just won't be enough tactical air power in Western Europe during 1951-52, barring some such stroke of luck as a sud-

den satisfactory ending of the Korean War which would permit the United States to switch all its tactical air power and Navy and Marine aviation from that theater to Europe.

Facing this prospect, it is easy to see why the United States and British Navies are rushing carriers and naval air groups into commission. It may yet prove that carrier-borne aircraft are the one hope of providing adequate air cover and support for the ground forces defending Western Europe during the critical period that lies just ahead of us.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, in the same connection I noticed on today's ticker a report by the United Press, relating to this subject. I shall read two sentences from that report:

A delayed start is about to be made on the task of providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army.

This problem, which is becoming critical, will stand high on the agenda of American, British, Canadian, and French Air Force chiefs when they meet here next Monday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire United Press dispatch printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A delayed start is about to be made on the task of providing air support for the Atlantic Pact army.

This problem, which is becoming critical, will stand high on the agenda of American, British, Canadian, and French Air Force chiefs when they meet here next Monday.

An informed Pentagon source said the conference can be called a "beginning" of joint efforts to give General Eisenhower's international ground forces adequate tactical air cover. His divisions are vulnerable on that score now.

American plans call for stationing six army divisions in Europe. That normally would indicate six United States Air Force groups. But air force officers are certain, on the basis of current information on other air arms, that their contribution will have to be much greater if Eisenhower's projected 40 divisions are to have enough air cover.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, United States Air Force Chief of Staff, called next week's meeting to discuss matters of mutual interest with Air Marshal Sir John Slessor of the RAF, Air Marshal W. A. Curtis of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and Gen. Charles Francols Lecheres of the French Air Force. Significantly, the chiefs will be accompanied by their supply officers.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say that it seems to me to be something more than surprising—it is no less than astounding—that the question of an adequate air force to protect the American boys who are to be sent to Europe does not have a higher place on the agenda of the Senate in view of the fact that when American boys are being sent to Europe, judging from all the available evidence, they may be shot like sitting ducks.

When the question was under discussion in the Senate, evidence was presented to show that the forces of the free world in Europe, in terms of front-line air power, are today outnumbered by the Russians by as much as 10 to 1. Testimony was offered from no less an authority than Gen. Carl Spaatz that if the American air program is carried out and if Russia does not build a single addi-



tional plane—which, of course, is an implausible assumption—then at the end of 1952 the forces of the free world will be outnumbered, in terms of front-line air defense, by at least 5 to 1. Notwithstanding that evidence, Mr. President, the Senate approved the resolution calling for the sending to Europe of 4 divisions of American ground forces.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Speaking of delayed starts, I am sure the Senator from Missouri noted that we are about to send a military mission of approximately 800 men to Formosa. Does the Senator know of any reason why, if that is good policy today, it was not good policy back in December, at the very moment when the Communists attacked in Korea?

Mr. KEM. I know of no reason why it was not a sound policy last December, and ever since. It would seem to me to be another case of too little and too late.

#### THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it must be a great surprise to those who are in the galleries and to those who will read what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said here in the Senate Chamber this afternoon, to learn from him that we were in war in Greece or that Greece had a war. Yet that is the impression the Senator from Arkansas attempted to leave with the Senate and with those who were in the galleries and were listening to his remarks, namely, that the United States participated in a war in Greece. I do not think the Senator from Arkansas is going to fool the American people about that. I believe the attention of the Senate should be called to the true facts.

We did send approximately 100 military advisers to Greece, a few years ago; and they advised—to what extent, I do not know, and I do not know of any other Member of the Senate who does know—some 95,000 Greek soldiers, which was the size of the Greek Army. Those 95,000 Greek soldiers, who were advised—there is no question about that—by a small number of American officers, were trying to suppress about 25,000 guerrillas. Many of those guerrillas were Greeks, and some of them came over the border from Yugoslavia. So 95,000 soldiers in the regular Greek Army were trying to suppress 25,000 guerrillas; and we had a few officers in Greece, advising the Greek Army. At no time were any American soldiers there, in the sense in which we generally think of soldiers. At no time did any American fire a shot there; and at no time was there ever a war there.

The facts are that the guerrillas finally were suppressed because of the fact that when the Yugoslav Government broke with the Kremlin, the Yugoslavs denied the guerrillas any further bases in Yugoslavia, whereas theretofore the guerrillas had been crossing into Greece from Yugoslavia. It was guerrilla warfare.

Why any Member of the Senate would attempt to make the American people believe that we had a war in Greece, and that if General MacArthur had handled the war in Korea in the way Gen-

eral Van Fleet handled the situation in Greece, things today in Korea would be different, I cannot understand. I do not know how gullible some persons believe the American people to be or how gullible the other Members of the Senate are regarded as being.

The Senator from Arkansas also said that when a war has begun, no one can tell how far it may spread. All of us can agree 100 percent with that statement; and I am wondering why the President of the United States did not give a little thought to that when he, and he alone, sent United States forces into Korea. Today some persons would like to leave the impression that the Korean War is General MacArthur's war. However, Mr. President, the President of the United States sent the American forces into the Korean War. General MacArthur did not do that. The Republican Party did not do that. The United States Senate did not do that. The Congress of the United States did not do that. No individual Senators on the other side of the aisle did that; no individual Senators on this side of the aisle did that. The President of the United States himself, and he alone, sent the American forces and the United Nations forces into Korea.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. For my own information—although I can get it by examining the RECORD—let me ask how the Senator from Indiana spoke about that matter last June. Did he make any protest, or did he agree with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] the chairman of the Republican policy committee, that if he had been consulted, he would have approved our going into Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. The answer is very simple, and it is this: I was opposed to it then; I am opposed to it now; and if I had my way, I would take our troops out of Korea this very afternoon.

Mr. McMAHON. I am merely asking for information.

Mr. CAPEHART. The record on that matter is very clear.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator from Indiana make a speech, last June, denouncing our going into Korea?

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly did; in fact, I made dozens of speeches.

Mr. McMAHON. I shall look them up. I thank the Senator very much for the information. I thought he might agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Connecticut has entirely misrepresented what I said at the time of the beginning of the Korean war. I never said that if I had been consulted, I would have advised our going into the Korean war. To the contrary, I said that I thought that if the matter had been put up to Congress, Congress probably would have approved that action after it had been taken, but that there was no choice except to back up the troops, once they were there.

I read now from the speech I made at that time:

It seems to me that the new policy is adopted at an unfortunate time, and involves a very difficult military operation indeed—the defense of Korea. I sincerely hope that our Armed Forces may be successful in Korea. I sincerely hope that the policy thus adopted will not lead to war with Russia. In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right—

That is, of preventing aggression—

and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

As a matter of fact, of course, I was not consulted, and I did not say what I would have done had I been consulted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been listening for several days to speeches by those who are opposed to General MacArthur. I have listened to one such speech this afternoon. In every one of those speeches we are told that we have not a possible chance of winning in Asia, that we have not a possible chance of winning against Chinese Communists, and that we have not a possible chance of winning in Korea. Every one of them tells us that if we follow General MacArthur's policies we shall get into a third world war. The alternative to that, according to each and every speaker, is to sit in Korea and see X number of American boys killed every day. That is the alternative. I have not heard any other alternative.

The able speaker this afternoon, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and other Senators who were questioning him, said that if the Chinese Communists attacked our troops with airplanes, or used submarines, we would then retaliate. It does not quite make sense to me. Suppose they sent into battle a million troops on land, but never used airplanes, and never used submarines; would that be perfectly all right? Would no one object to it? Is that what we are to understand, that it is only in the event of their attacking our armies with airplanes and using submarines against our ships that we shall retaliate and use the arm which is the strongest—the Air Force? Is that what we are to understand? Is that their policy?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish my thought, and then I shall yield. Is that what they mean? Is that their policy? Is it their policy that we shall stay in Korea no longer? These are their words, not mine; these are their thoughts, not mine.

(At this point Mr. CAPEHART yielded for discussion of a message received from the President of the United States, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate headline.)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator understand it to be the theme of the Senator from Arkansas, as I did,

that if the Russians or the Chinese Communists were to attack us from across the border with airplanes, we would then be justified in making a retaliatory attack across the border?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is exactly what he said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator get any explanation or answer or statement regarding why, if that be the premise of the Senator from Arkansas, of the Senator from Minnesota, and of other Senators who seem to support the doctrine of those opposing General MacArthur, it is wrong for us now to retaliate across the border when the Red Chinese attack us with tanks, with armor, and with foot soldiers from across the border? Did the Senator hear any statement or explanation which would answer that peculiar line of reasoning?

Mr. CAPEHART. I was about to go into that question when the message came from the President, and I was interrupted. I was about to develop that thought. Senators have said we will retaliate and will do what General MacArthur has recommended, if the enemy sends airplanes into Korea to kill American boys, but if they send 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or 10,000,000 men or 10,000 tanks across the border to kill American boys, that will be perfectly all right, and we will not do anything at all about it. So long as the Chinese Communists stay on the land, it is said, it makes no difference what they do; but if they get up in the air—and I can well understand, of course, why some of our friends on the other side would talk about getting up in the air, because they are always up in the air—if they get up in the air and attack us, then we are going to retaliate; and we will retaliate also, if they attack us with submarines. What is the difference? What are they thinking about?

There was another very noticeable thing in the speech of the able Senator from Arkansas, namely, that he talked about world war III being precipitated by firebrands. He talked about someone doing what Napoleon once did and what the Kaiser once did, and about our becoming an imperialistic nation; but he wants to stop all that sort of thing.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate certain activities in which this Nation has participated during the past 3 years which might possibly provoke war, possibly lead to war. I refer to military aid to Greece, military aid to Turkey, the Atlantic Pact, military aid to Europe, the Korean war, the sending of General Eisenhower to Europe, and the spending of billions and billions and billions of dollars at the moment for national defense. Those are things those on the other side of the aisle, the opposition, have recommended. They were not recommended by the Republicans; they were not recommended by MacArthur; they were recommended by those on the other side of the aisle who would now accuse the great American, the great general, of trying to start world war III.

For some unknown reason, they seem to wish to think that the American people are so gullible that they do not know

that we now have a war in Korea. They keep talking about keeping out of war, and about preserving peace, when we today are at war in Korea, and have been for nearly a year. They talk about a limited war. They are in favor of limiting the war to the little Korean peninsula. If that is the only interest they have, if that is all they expect to accomplish; if, as they tell us, it is impossible for us ever to win on the continent of Asia, then, Mr. President, I say let us withdraw our troops from the United Nations forces in Korea, and let us withdraw them immediately. That is one way to avoid world war III.

Referring to the reasoning of Senators on the other side of the aisle, they say that if we permitted General MacArthur to bomb Manchurian bases it might result in starting world war III. They also admit that if the Chinese Communists sent over airplanes and bombed our forces, we would retaliate, and that would start world war III. Then we are told in the next breath that we cannot possibly win on the coast of Asia. Then, in the name of all that is holy, why are we sticking around in Korea? There is no question about it in my mind. They talk about keeping the friendship of our allies, cooperating with them, and keeping them as friends in order that we may use their territory for bases, in France, and in other nations. It is my best judgment that nothing would please the British or the French more than to see the armies withdrawn from Korea. Why are we remaining there and losing 1,500 American lives every week? The way the war is going there at the moment, we may lose three or four or five times that number.

My position on the whole matter, after listening to the debate during the past 10 days, after listening to General MacArthur, after listening to the President of the United States, after listening to Senators on the floor, and after reading newspaper report after newspaper report, is that I must reach the definite conclusion that the best interests of the United States and of the United Nations lie in withdrawing our armies from Korea, and I so recommend, Mr. President.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

During Mr. CAPEHART's address, A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I presume this is a message from the President on the National Production Act, the so-called extension from June 30. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is there any allotted time for the reading of the message, or what is its status?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Indiana would yield at this point—

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not ask the Senator to do that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall conclude within about 3 or 4 or 5 minutes, after which I shall yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not make that request. I merely desire to know when the message may be read, because I have a short statement which I want to make after it is read.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall yield the floor in 4 or 5 minutes.

After the conclusion of Mr. CAPEHART's speech,

#### THE MACARTHUR CONTROVERSY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I realize that there is a message from the President of the United States to be read, but with the indulgence of the Chair and of the Senator from South Carolina—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator that have I no wish to shut off debate. I want Senators to take as much time as they need. I only wanted to know when the message would be read, so that I could follow with a brief statement.

Mr. McMAHON. It will take me approximately 3 minutes to make what I hope will be a contribution to the discussion and debate.

I think it would be well, in view of the colloquy which has occurred, that I quote from the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] entitled "The Korean Crisis," which he delivered 2 days after the outbreak of the situation in Korea, a copy of which the Senator very courteously gave me. He read a paragraph from it. Perhaps I should read it again. He said:

I sincerely hope that the policy thus adopted will not lead to war with Russia. In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

In other words, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio determined that we were right on the principle involved; and he said the only thing to do, if we were right on the principle—and I know the Senator from Ohio is a man of principle—was to back up that principle by sending armies into Korea. He proceeded:

I shall discuss later the question of whether the President is usurping his powers as Commander in Chief. My own opinion is that he is doing so; that there is no legal authority for what he has done. But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

In other words, the Senator from Ohio, I repeat, because I notice the Senator has come onto the floor, is a man of principle, and, being a man of principle, he recognizes a principle. That is why he said in his speech:

In any event, I believe the general principle of the policy is right, and I see no choice except to back up wholeheartedly and with every available resource the men in our



Armed Forces who have been moved into Korea.

He said further:

There is no legal authority for what he has done. But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

The Senator from Ohio would vote in favor of what? He would vote in favor of the implementation of the principle which he believed—and I join with him in the belief—was right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has been perfectly fair. I just gave him a copy of my statement.

Mr. McMAHON. And I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. TAFT. If I had been consulted about it before the President took action I would have advised against doing anything of the kind. I was expressing the opinion of the Republican conference that we should not go into Korea. But, having gone there, and the general principle being right, if a resolution were presented to the Congress I saw no choice except to give the utmost support to the boys who were in Korea. That is what I said, and it is undoubtedly sound.

My doubt about the Korean matter is not as to the morality of it. After all, the general principle of preventing aggression anywhere in the world is right. The question is as to the practicability of having chosen that particular place, in which we are not strong, where we have to exert infinitely more power than the result would have justified, if we had considered it from the beginning. The doubt revolved about the place. In three instances in the speech doubt is expressed as to whether the President had chosen the proper place to make a demonstration against aggression, if it could be successful. As a matter of fact, we find it cannot be successful. The Communists have not only aggressed against us and against the United Nations itself, but they have conquered half of Korea, and they stand there today as evidence of successful aggression. The United Nations is not willing to punish them. It has abandoned the whole moral principle to which I referred. It can no longer punish the aggressor, because the aggressor is too strong to handle, and because it is inconvenient for our allies to go along in any such punishment. That is what I meant when I said I doubted whether the President had chosen the right place or the right circumstances for the effort to enforce the principle of punishing an aggressor.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator for his interpretation of his speech. The speech speaks for itself. The Senator from Ohio did say that the principle under which we went into Korea was right. So far as the aggressor not being punished for his aggression is concerned, the tides of battle may ebb and flow, and even as we are talking that process is going on, on the battlefields of Korea. But if we are to believe the reports which we have received in the past 2 days, the en-

emy is paying most heavily for his aggression.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator thinks the principle is right, why is he not for an all-out war against Red China to punish the aggressor who has aggressed against the United Nations?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Ohio was not here, and could not be here because of other official duties, to listen to the Senator from Connecticut on the day before yesterday, when, in approximately 2 hours, I expounded very fully my reasons why we should not precipitate an all-out war in the Far East.

Mr. TAFT. Unfortunately, I was not present. I read the Senator's statement, and I intend to answer it on the floor of the Senate at the proper time.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure the Senator, with his usual generosity, will permit me to engage in a debate with him with reference to his speech and the philosophy on which it is based. I say to the Senator that I look forward to the occasion with a great deal of anticipation and with the hope that he and I can make a contribution to the enlightenment of the American people, which I trust is the purpose of these debates.

Mr. President, I should like to read into the Record at this point what I think is a most unusual comment in an editorial in one of the great newspapers of the country. I refer to the Christian Science Monitor. The editorial is entitled "Victory by Steadfastness," and was published on April 19, 1951. I do not know whether the editorial was written by Mr. Erwin Canham. It reads as though he wrote it, because it has the earmarks of his style. He has one of the finest brains in America. The editorial reads:

We hope both General MacArthur and the American people get a full measure of joy out of his homecoming celebrations. Parades and cheers are better forms of emotional release than the first violent and vindictive reactions to his removal, still echoing unhappily in congressional charges and countercharges of appeasers and war party. But soon Congress and country must get down to calmer consideration and clearer decision on the basic issues of far-eastern policy.

If another Korea should suddenly flare in Iran or Yugoslavia, the desperate disunity of this moment would hamper effective action by the United States. Even to carry on present undertakings an early end is essential to what Senator Duff has called a tremendous emotional binge. Too many Americans have been, as he says, "taking sides on the basis of personalities involved and not on a calm dispassionate or clear analysis of the over-all problem—namely, the safety of our country." Another Republican Senator, CAIN of Washington, objecting to politics as usual, seeks to clarify policy by introducing two contrary resolutions—one declaring war on China, the other providing for the recall of troops from Korea.

We thoroughly agree with Senator CAIN's desire to get Congress to act on policy, but believe he has misjudged the situation. The choice is not between all-out war on China and the abandonment of Korea. There is a third and middle course between these extremes. It is less simple, not easy for the impatient to accept—

I presume that would include the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—

but it is positive and capable of achieving genuine victories. It is the policy of continued and vigorous United Nations effort to demonstrate that aggression does not pay.

As applied in Korea, this course provides for holding South Korea and making the Chinese Reds pay heavily for their intervention. It involves the possibility of a long-drawn, indecisive battle there. But it holds also the possibility of peace on terms which will mean essential defeat for the Communists. Militarily it regards Korea as having certain clear advantages so long as Russia does not come in. The peninsula permits extensive use of sea power and restricts the line the UN's numerically inferior forces must hold. And air cover affords tremendous advantage. So long as it is necessary to fight the Chinese, the ground is possibly the most favorable to be found on the continent of Asia.

But this policy regards Korea as only one active sector in a world-wide struggle. It seeks to limit active hostilities so far as possible. It reckons that time is on the side of the rearming free peoples. Moreover, it considers cooperation by the non-Communist nations as essential to eventual victory in the world struggle. It therefore stresses unity and policies on which UN members can unite rather than unilateral action by any nation. It also is based on a conviction that the struggle is first of all one of ideas, with victory resting not on quick military measures but on the slower conquest of hearts and minds.

This third course is not a policy either for appeasers or for a war party. Few Americans really favor either extreme—whatever politicians shout—and we believe that when the three choices are clearly laid before the people they will choose the middle way. It will use war where necessary to halt aggression, but it will not widen war unless forced by the Communists. It seeks peace—by peaceful means if possible—but not by appeasement. It requires not only steadfast courage against foes but steadfast patience with friends. It is a rugged road, but it leads toward the truest victory.

Mr. President, I have taken the trouble to read the editorial into the RECORD at this point in the debate because it seems to be very appropriate to the remarks which were made by the Senator from Indiana. I may add that although I had not seen the editorial until last evening, and the speech on the same subject which I delivered day before yesterday was written and delivered before I had read the editorial, it so truly states my philosophy in a much briefer form than I could state it on the floor of the Senate day before yesterday, that I wanted to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on pp. 4447-4451.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a bill to carry out the

message of the President which has just been read.

The bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (by request), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to state that as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am introducing the proposed legislation which carries out the recommendations of the President's message. This is not my bill. I am doing this by request, in order that a bill may be formally placed before the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration prior to the expiration of all of the present authority on June 30.

I want to make it clear, in no uncertain terms, that this consideration means extensive hearings.

Here is a bill which reaches into the stockroom, the production line, and the cash register of every business in this country. It also reaches into the pantry and the family purse of every home in this country.

Hearings will begin on Monday, May 7, at 10:30 a. m.

For the first week, the committee will hear all the Government officials who will be charged with the administration of the proposed act. I am determined that these officials shall make a clear, concise record of exactly what they propose to do with this authority.

For the next 3 weeks the committee will spend every day with representatives of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers.

In this proposed legislation there are certain provisions to which I am opposed, as my record in the past shows clearly.

It will be impossible, of course, during the 3 weeks of hearings to hear all the persons who are requesting an opportunity to testify. However, insofar as it is possible, the committee will listen with interest to representatives of all the major organizations who will speak in behalf of the interests of every segment of the national economy.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill may be printed in the RECORD in the same type that is used for the printing of the President's message, in order to facilitate the reading of both of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (CITED AS THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1951)**

**TITLE I. AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950**

**Priorities and allocations**

Section 101 revises the so-called antihoarding provisions of the Defense Production Act under which the President may designate as scarce those materials, the supply of which is threatened as a result of accumulations beyond the reasonable demands of business or personal needs. The accumulation of such designated materials is unlawful. The proposed amendment would make it clear that although a material has been designated

as scarce by the President, he may prescribe conditions and exceptions allowing the maintenance of substantial inventories of such material when special circumstances, such as the need for increased imports of the material, require such action.

**Authority to requisition and condemn**

Section 102 adds to the Defense Production Act specific authority to acquire real and personal property by condemnation, as well as by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer. The proposed amendment would afford to the Government an expeditious means of acquiring property when the President deemed such action necessary in the interest of the national defense. Authority to take immediate possession upon filing a condemnation petition and to utilize the property prior to approval of title by the Attorney General is provided in the amendment.

**Expansion of productive capacity and supply**

Section 103 revises section 303 of the Defense Production Act, the section which presently authorizes limited procurement by the Government of certain materials (in some cases with advance payments or involving anticipated loss on resale). It also provides for the installation of equipment in private and Government-owned facilities. The revisions are summarized as follows:

(1) The procurement authority is broadened to include purchases of critical materials generally, in lieu of the present limitation to purchases of raw materials.

(2) The prohibition in the act on procurement of imported agricultural commodities for resale for other than stockpiling or industrial uses is eliminated and the restrictions relating to resale prices of foreign agricultural commodities are removed.

(3) In order to assure the continuance of necessary domestic production under the ceiling limitations imposed by the stabilization program and to aid in assuring stable prices in the face of temporary increases in certain costs of operation, authority is provided to make limited subsidy payments in the case of high-cost domestic producers of materials and processors of agricultural commodities and in those instances where temporary increases in production, distribution or transportation costs threaten to impair maximum production or supply of a material.

(4) Authority for construction and operation by the Government of facilities for the manufacture and marketing of materials needed in the national defense effort is also provided. This authority, which is similar to that given the Defense Plants Corporation in World War II, would enable the Government to build facilities with due consideration being given to strategic location, and to construct plants which private industry does not wish to undertake in view of their lack of utility for peacetime purposes.

(5) The Government is empowered to install processes and improvements in privately owned facilities, in addition to present authority to install Government-owned equipment in such facilities.

(6) In order to carry out the business-type operations which would be undertaken under the provisions of section 303 of the Defense Production Act, authority is provided for the creation of corporations with specific powers generally accorded corporations.

(7) In order to finance the procurement, loan, and production activities deemed necessary in the defense program, the present limitations on authorized funds is removed, and instead provision is made by means of specific appropriations for determination of the amounts to be made available to carry out these functions.

**Price and wage stabilization**

Section 104 contains the following revisions in title IV of the Defense Production Act which authorizes price and wage controls and provides for their administration:

(1) Section 402 (d) (3) of the act contains the provisions dealing with the imposition of ceilings on agricultural commodities. That section, among other things, provides that a ceiling may not be imposed below the parity price of the agricultural commodity in question. In view of the fluctuation of parity prices, which are now computed on a monthly basis, considerable difficulty is encountered in imposing ceilings with any degree of permanency on agricultural commodities which are selling at prices close to the parity level. Accordingly, in order to facilitate administration of the stabilization program the proposed amendment provides that for price-control purposes the parity price of a commodity shall be the parity price as of the beginning of the marketing season or year for that commodity. This parity price would be fixed for the duration of the marketing season or year, with parity to be recomputed at the beginning of the next marketing season or year. This approach is similar to that followed under the current price-support program in which an annual support price, based on parity, is announced at the beginning of the marketing season for each commodity.

Another change proposed by amendments to section 402 (d) (3) requires that any subsidy payments under title III of the act to agricultural producers be included in the price received by such producers in ascertaining whether the requirement concerning minimum ceilings at the parity level has been met. In addition, the provision dealing with imposition of ceilings on fluid milk in areas not under marketing agreements would be revised to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to determine fair ceiling prices for such products taking into account the general factors applied in determining the price in areas under marketing agreements.

(2) The provision of section 402 (e) (v) exempting from price-control authority, the rates charged by common carriers and other public utilities is revised to provide that only common carriers and public utilities whose rates are subject to the control of a public regulatory body are so exempt. In addition, it is provided that notice of proposed increases and consent to intervention by the Government must be given in the case of all proposed increases in charges, in contrast to the present provision whereby such action is required only in cases involving resale of property or services to the public for which application is filed with the appropriate public authority.

(3) There is added to the present requirement in section 404 for consultation with persons substantially affected by orders and regulations, a provision for consultation with representatives of businessmen, farmers, workers, and consumers.

(4) In order to strengthen enforcement of price controls, the proposed amendments in section 104 provide:

(a) An addition to section 405 (a) of the act empowering the President to prescribe the extent to which payments above price ceilings may be disallowed by the Government for tax and other purposes (similar to present provision in section 405 (b) relating to violations of wage stabilization regulations).

(b) Specific provision in section 409 making such remedies as restitution available although a court may not have granted an injunction or restraining order, and giving State courts jurisdiction over civil actions involving violations of price regulations.

(c) Deletion of the \$10,000 limitation in section 409 on the amount recoverable from a price violator in excess of the actual amount involved in the violation.

(d) Provision in section 409 for disallowance for tax and other purposes of fines, penalties or compromise sums paid as a result of price violations.



(e) Addition in section 409 of licensing authority as a further means of enforcing price controls. Under this authority duly licensed persons would be given warnings of their price violations and could suffer suspension of licenses, for a period not to exceed 12 months, for failure to heed such warnings. Appropriate judicial review of suspension actions is provided.

#### Rent stabilization

Section 105 introduces in the Defense Production Act a new title IV-A on rent stabilization. Under this title the President is granted permissive authority to establish maximum rents on housing accommodations and on business accommodations in any area in which he deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives of the act.

Title IV-A provides that for housing accommodations under control at the effective date of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, the maximum rents shall be the maximum rents in effect on that date. Mandatory provision is made for adjustment in rents to cover increases in operating and maintenance costs for which landlords have not been previously compensated. For all other housing accommodations the maximum rents may be established by the President giving due consideration to rents prevailing on comparable housing accommodations during the May 24 to June 24, 1950, period, but no consideration shall be given to increases in rents after January 25, 1951. The President is given permissive authority to make such individual and general adjustments increasing or decreasing rents as may be necessary to remove hardships or to correct inequities. Provision for furnishing general information and assistance to tenants and small landlords is included in the title. The President, upon his own initiative or upon that of local advisory boards (which are continued in existence or reconstituted, as the case may be, under this title) may provide for decontrol of maximum rents when he deems maintenance of such control no longer necessary to effectuate the purposes of the title.

For business accommodations, the President may establish maximum rents giving due consideration to rents prevailing on such date as he deems appropriate, but in no event earlier than June 24, 1950. Individuals and general adjustments increasing or decreasing maximum rents may be made to remove hardships or to correct inequities.

Provision is made in this title for protest, review and enforcement procedures, similar to those provided in title IV of the Defense Production Act relating to price and wage stabilization, and criminal sanctions are also provided.

The authority of title IV-A is to be administered through the new independent agency (the Economic Stabilization Agency) created under section 403 of the Defense Production Act.

#### Control of credit

Section 106 revises section 602 (d) (1) of the act so as to extend control of credit on real estate to existing as well as to new construction. In addition, criminal sanctions are made applicable to violations of orders or regulations issued under section 605 of the act dealing with Government real estate loan programs. Finally, specific authority is added to section 605 for the enforcement of conditions and requirements imposed in connection with the relaxation of residential credit controls under that section.

Section 106 also adds to the Defense Production Act a new subtitle B—Commodity Speculation—which amends the Commodity Exchange Act so as to authorize the President, when he deems such action necessary, to prescribe rules and regulations covering margin requirements for speculative purchases or sales on commodity exchanges.

Specific provision is made preserving bona fide hedging transactions.

#### General provisions

Section 107 makes appropriate changes in the table of contents of the Defense Production Act.

Section 108 makes the following changes in title VII of the Defense Production Act:

(1) Revises section 703 (a) of the act to provide authority for the payment of compensation to one person who is the head of an agency created under the Defense Production Act at a rate comparable to the compensation paid heads of executive departments.

(2) Introduces two new provisions authorizing the President (a) to obtain information necessary in evaluating existing legislative and administrative provisions for national defense, and (b) to dispense with any of the statistical work presently required by law where such action is deemed by the President to be in the interest of national defense.

(3) Changes section 706 of the act to broaden the relief a court may grant when the Government seeks to enjoin violations of the act. This would make it clear that there could be restitution even though no injunctive relief is ordered.

(4) Provides that Federal courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction of criminal cases and of civil cases except where otherwise provided in the act regardless of the amount in controversy, and makes a technical correction to assure effective enforcement of the criminal sanctions provided in the act.

(5) Authorizes the President to provide for the printing and distribution, in such number and manner as he deems appropriate, of reports on the actions taken to carry out the objectives of the Defense Production Act.

(6) Extends the Defense Production Act to June 30, 1953.

#### TITLE II. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 201 repeals the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, but preserves outstanding actions with respect to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred under the act prior to its repeal. In addition, it is provided that the powers, duties and functions of this section shall be administered by the President through the new independent agency created under section 403 of the Defense Production Act. Provision is made for the transfer to that agency of the functions, records, personnel, and unexpended funds, and so forth, of the Office of the Housing Expediter.

Section 202 provides for veterans' preference in the purchase and rental of newly constructed and newly converted housing accommodations. The President is authorized to administer these provisions and may delegate such authority to any officer or agency of the Government. This authority terminates on June 30, 1953, unless terminated earlier by Presidential proclamation or by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. The veterans' preference provisions are similar to those contained in the existing Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which are now being administered by the Housing Expediter.

In addition, section 202 specifically repeals the provisions of certain appropriation acts according priority rights to World War II veterans in the acquisition of materials required for the construction, alteration, or repair of dwellings to be occupied by them. Any priorities on materials or housing facilities granted to World War II veterans under the Veterans Housing Act of 1946 and prior to the enactment of the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951 are specifically preserved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have just listened to the reading of the mes-

sage the President has sent to Congress. It is extremely unfortunate that the President has made certain of those proposals at the beginning of the planting season. If the President had set out to find the most effective way to reduce crop production in the United States for this year, he could hardly have found a more effective means than the proposal to freeze the parity prices of farm commodities as of a single date and to hold that freeze for a year.

Mr. President, parity can not be frozen; when the parity price is frozen, it ceases to be parity.

What the President is proposing is not to freeze parity, but to destroy the parity formula.

Mr. President, all of us know that the prices of certain farm commodities will vary as much as 100 percent from one part of the year to another. How can we do what the President demands—in other words, freeze the parity prices as of a certain date—and require those prices to be held for 1 year? If the parity prices of agricultural products are frozen out of season, that is unfair to the consumers. If those prices are frozen when they are lowest, certain self-appointed spokesmen for consumers might be happy, but certainly the result would be to bring the American farmers almost to the point of disaster.

Mr. President, it is apparent that those who for years have harbored the hope of making the farmer dependent upon a Government check for his income, are still guiding the hand of the administration. If the parity prices of agricultural products are frozen as of a certain date, the result will be entirely unfair, for we know that the price of labor is bound to rise, we know that the charges for transportation are constantly rising, and we know that the prices of the things farmers have to buy are constantly rising. We know that interest charges already are on the rise. When those price increases occur, if the prices of the things the farmers produce are frozen, so that those prices cannot rise with the rise in the prices of the things farmers have to buy, the result is to put a squeeze on the farmer, so that he has the choice of either going out of business or of calling on the Government for a hand-out to enable him to keep in production.

Mr. President, let me repeat that it is most unfortunate that the President has seen fit to make such an outlandish and unfair proposal at the very beginning of the planting season. The result can only be reduced planting in a year when maximum production is of vital importance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the prices of the things produced by farmers never go up until all other prices rise; in other words, that the parity price is based on the prices of the things the farmers have to buy, and that any change in the parity price follows the changes in other prices?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from South Carolina is absolutely correct. Farm

parity prices never lead the way to higher wage or cost levels; they always follow. If the cost of goods and services which the farmer has to buy is kept down, parity prices have to stay down.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, the higher wage levels lead the parity price levels.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me repeat. I am amazed at a proposition of this kind being placed before the Congress at a time when we are trying to induce maximum production of farm crops.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont does not feel, as I do, that there would be no objection whatever to the policy proposal if wages and industrial goods prices were also frozen at present prices, or frozen at least once a year, as would be the case with respect to commodity prices.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be the only fair way to do, although I do not think there is any absolutely fair way of freezing wages, either, or industrial prices or industrial profits. Quite recently the OPS announced the freezing of profits at not to exceed 85 percent of the profits which prevailed for a corporation during the three best years of the period 1946-49. It did not mean that each manufacturer might make up to 85 percent of the profit he made during those years. It meant, and it has been made plain, that he may make up to 85 percent of the average profit made by the industry during the 3 years. It leaves the independent manufacturer in a very unenviable position. He cannot possibly compete with great corporations who have been financed at Government expense and who have virtual access to the United States Treasury in carrying on their work. In regard to the order freezing profits: Although I think we should try to find some means of keeping them from getting out of hand, yet that is going to react to the serious disadvantage of the small-business man.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. This price freeze comes at a time, does it not, when industrial profits are at an all-time high?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely. On the subject of profits and wages, I think it was pointed out to a House committee by the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, or possibly day before yesterday, that the farmer's dollar will now buy 50 percent less goods than in 1945, and that the average hourly earnings of the farmer of 69 cents an hour is 9 cents an hour less than the average hourly earnings of the farmer's hired man. Farm labor for the country averages 78 or 79 cents an hour at the present time. The average hourly earnings of the farmer—the man who owns the farm; the man who, with his family, tries to run it—

was given by the Secretary as 69 cents an hour, or 6 cents an hour less than the minimum wage allowed to the poorest worker coming under the minimum-wage law.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now presiding over the Senate, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received two telegrams, together with a request that they be read on the floor of the Senate. The telegrams relate to Senate bill 984. I now ask unanimous consent that they may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1951.  
Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,  
Senate Office Building:

The American Federation of Labor offers its objections to the enactment of S. 984 to provide for the recruitment and importation of Mexican workers for agricultural labor in the United States which is now pending before the Senate.

The bill as reported by the committee does not provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of domestic farm labor and is contrary to the findings and recommendations of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor which was issued March 26, 1951.

The report clearly indicates that the importation of foreign farm labor would be to depress still further the wages and working conditions of American farm labor, a group

which is worse off economically than any other in our population.

The A. F. of L. firmly believes that the need for the importation of foreign labor is overemphasized. At the present time there are approximately 150,000 agricultural workers in Puerto Rico unemployed and there are 190,000 partially employed working less than 30 hours per week. However if there is a genuine need for agricultural labor the Puerto Rican and domestic labor market should be fully utilized before importing foreign labor.

We strongly urge that S. 984 in its present form be recommitted back to committee with instructions to provide for the recruitment of American workers wherever they are needed under decent working conditions and adequate wages before any attempt is made to bring in foreign farm labor.

WILLIAM GREEN,  
President, American Federation of Labor.

Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,  
Senate Majority Leader:

National Farmers Union believes S. 984 should be defeated. Bringing in cheap foreign labor without setting decent standards and without first trying to recruit tremendous numbers of unemployed American agricultural workers breaks faith with the American people and their ideals. This supply of cheap foreign labor threatens both the family farm as the basic pattern of American agriculture and the hard earned gains of American labor. This bill violates President Truman's manpower policy declaration of January 17 giving full assurance that "full use of domestic manpower resources will be made before bringing in foreign workers." It ignores careful findings of Sparkman committee report on low-income rural families revealing existence of equivalent of more than 2,500,000 underemployed agricultural workers. Bill was reported out before President's commission on migratory labor gave its report to the President portraying disgraceful conditions of migrant workers and subservience of many Government officials to pressures of big growers. We urge Senate to reject this bill and consider first legislation for the effective utilization of American workers.

JAMES G. PATTON,  
President of National Farmers Union.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am sure a great number of Senators would like to hear the distinguished Senator explain this important legislation, and I ask whether he will yield for a quorum call, on condition that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.



The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Lehman
Brewster	Hayden	McCarran
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	McFarland
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Maybank
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Watkins
Dworshak	Knowland	Welker
Ellender	Langer	Wherry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. STENNIS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. THYE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. HILL, Mr. FREAR, Mr. ECTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KEM, Mr. HUNT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KERR, Mr. HENNINGSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. IVES, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. TAFT, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEELY entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### SUPPLYING OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS FROM MEXICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 984) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will proceed with dispatch to the consideration of the pending measure. I consider its passage to be urgent, since it is necessary that we implement, as soon as possible, the agreement with the Republic of Mexico for the importation of Mexican labor.

Before proceeding with an explanation of the bill, I should like to make a few remarks on the events which led to its introduction. As will be recalled, an agreement was entered into by our Government in 1948 with the Mexican Government for the importation of Mexican labor. The method adopted for importing workers was that upon certification by the United States Employment Service, an employer could go into Mexico and contract for Mexican labor. Under the agreement which was entered into by the employers of this country with the

workers in Mexico, the employers paid all the expenses of transportation from the interior of Mexico, as well as the expenses of subsistence and maintenance while in transit to the place of employment.

The agreement entered into in 1948 was renewed in 1949 with certain changes. Under the agreement of 1948, there was a provision whereby the employers in the United States deducted 10 percent from the wages of the Mexicans and then returned the amount withheld at the termination of employment. The reason for the deduction was to make certain that the Mexican laborer would have funds at the end of his employment and at the same time it would provide an incentive for the worker to carry out his part of the contract. When the agreement was renewed in 1949, the Mexican Government did not agree to this 10-percent deduction, and provision for it was eliminated in the agreement entered into in 1949.

Both the 1948 and 1949 agreements contained another provision which made it obligatory on the part of the employer to furnish a bond of \$25 to guarantee the return of the Mexican laborer at the termination of the contract. I may say that there was considerable objection on the part of the employers to that provision in the agreements with Mexico.

The Mexican Government gave notice early this year that it would not consent to continuance of the terms and conditions which now prevail, and that unless the Government of the United States took steps to enact laws whereby a guarantee of compliance by the employer with the individual work contract could be made by the Government of the United States, the agreement would be terminated.

I was privileged during last January and in the early part of February to attend a conference in Mexico City as a representative of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. I participated for a week in discussions with officials of our own Government as well as officials of the Mexican Government on the importation program of agricultural workers. We reached certain conclusions under which the Mexican Government was willing to proceed with future agreements with respect to the employment of Mexican labor in the United States. It was understood at the conference that the United States Government is not now authorized to recruit workers in Mexico. It was also understood that our Government cannot now guarantee the performance of any contract entered into between employers in this country and workers in Mexico.

So, Mr. President, in order for the United States to carry out its part of the agreement entered into between the United States and Mexico, it is necessary to enact the legislation now proposed. To my way of thinking, S. 984 will implement the agreement with Mexico in the best interests of both countries.

I have before me the main provisions which have been agreed to in conference between representatives of our Government and representatives of the Mexican Government. I wish to read those pro-

visions which are in the form of recommendations to our respective Governments.

First. The Mexican Government would establish migratory stations at such places in Mexico as might be agreed upon by the Mexican Government and the United States Government.

Second. Recruiting teams consisting of Mexican and United States representatives would then recruit agricultural workers at places near the residences of the workers, and the workers would be brought to the migratory stations by the Mexican Government.

Third. Following screening by the United States immigration officials, the workers would be transported to reception centers in the United States at the expense of the United States Government. Return transportation from the reception center to the migratory station by this Government would also be guaranteed.

Fourth. At the reception center in the United States, the worker would be free to choose the type of agricultural work he desires, and the employer would be free to select the workers whom he desires. Proper supervision of these negotiations by representatives of both governments would be maintained.

Fifth. Transportation from the reception center to the place of employment and return would be at the expense of the employer, as well as subsistence and other guaranties as required by the individual work contract.

In accordance with our understanding at the conference, I introduced Senate bill 984 to provide authority for our Government to carry out its part of the agreement reached with Mexico. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the bill along with other measures dealing with farm labor. During the course of our proceedings, we received extensive information on the farm-labor situation in the United States. Enactment of legislation providing subsidization of domestic farm labor as well as foreign labor was also recommended to us. However, the committee was of the opinion that the immediate legislation should be confined to its original subject, that is, the implementation of the agreement reached with Mexico this year, and that legislation concerned with a domestic farm-labor program and critical farm-labor shortages should be considered separately. In accordance with this decision, the committee is recommending enactment of Senate bill 984 at this time.

The bill would add a new title to the Agricultural Act of 1949. Section 501 of the proposed title 5 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to—

First. Recruit workers in Mexico for temporary agricultural employment in the United States;

Second. Establish and operate reception centers at or near the places of actual entry of such workers into the United States for the purpose of receiving and housing them while arrangements are being made for their employment in, or departure from, the United States;

Third. Provide transportation from recruitment centers in Mexico to such

reception centers and from such reception centers to recruitment centers after termination of employment;

Fourth. Provide such workers with such subsistence, emergency medical care, and burial expenses as may be or may become necessary during the transportation period and while such workers are at reception centers;

Fifth. Assist such workers and employers to negotiate contracts of employment; and

Sixth. Guarantee the performance by employers of provisions of such contracts relating to payment of wages or the furnishing of transportation.

The section also provides that the Secretary may recruit Mexicans already in the United States for agricultural employment, provided that such workers originally entered the country legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the distinguished Senator at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the recruiting of Mexican citizens who now are in the United States, is the reference to Mexican citizens who are in the United States legally, or is the reference also to Mexican citizens who may be in the United States illegally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The reference is only to those who are in the United States and who entered legally.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there are several amendments proposed by the committee, and I shall discuss them as I proceed, in the hope of saving time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will pardon me for the interruption.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. President, the section to which I have referred further provides that workers recruited under the program will be free to accept or decline agricultural employment with any eligible employer and to choose the type of agricultural employment they desire. Likewise, employers will be free to offer agricultural employment to any workers of their choice not under contract to other employers.

Section 502 provides that no workers shall be made available to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States to—

First. Indemnify the United States against any loss by reason of its guaranty of such employer's contracts.

Second. Reimburse the United States for expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed \$20 per worker.

Mr. President, it will be recalled, as I stated a moment ago, that the Mexican Government will establish centers within Mexico, at its own expense, with the idea of selecting the workers who are eligible to enter the United States. From those centers to points established in the United States, our Government will pay the transportation expenses of workers together with subsistence, but

these expenses will be recovered from the employer, up to an amount not exceeding the sum of \$20 a person.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a brief observation. If in the process of the application of the provisions of the bill the Senator from Louisiana is sponsoring, there happen to be some differences of opinion as between the position of the Senator from Louisiana and the position of some other Senators, let me say that will not be with the idea of opposing the carrying out any agreement which might have been made between the Government of the United States and the government of another country; but some of us think that possibly the committee did not give sufficient attention to American labor which could be available. Perhaps the Senator has that situation in mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that when the bill was first introduced we attempted to take care of labor recruitment not only in Mexico but also in all other countries in the Western Hemisphere, and Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Complications arose in that certain exceptions were desired here and there. Finally, inasmuch as the purpose of the entire proposal is to make an agreement with Mexico alone, the committee decided to confine the bill to that country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee obtain any information as to the availability of domestic American farm labor throughout the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; we received a good deal of testimony on the subject. I may say to my distinguished friend that we heard testimony not only pertaining to Senate bill 984, but also to the bill introduced by him and to the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I may ask the Senator from Louisiana another question, Did the committee have available the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. That report had not then been issued.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee consider that report after the bill had been reported to the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; we did not. However, the committee voted to report the bill prior to release of the Commission's report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I was interrupted—and I should like to say that I do not mind interruptions—I was outlining to the Senate the principal provisions of the pending measure, and I had discussed section 502 (1) and (2). I continue my analysis of the bill.

Third. Pay to the United States, in any case in which a worker is not returned to the reception center in accordance with the individual work contract,

and is apprehended in the United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost to the employer of returning other workers from the place of employment to the reception center, less any portion thereof required to be paid by any other employers.

Section 503 provides that no workers recruited under this program shall be available for employment in any area unless the director of State employment security for such area has determined and certified that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, and that the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee is familiar with the fact that that language of the bill, which specifies that the workers shall be available, is possibly a little misleading. It is quite true that they are not available at a particular time, but the domestic workers might be available by the time the harvest season arrived. In order to clarify that point and to get a legislative background, I propound this question to the chairman of the committee: Where the clause provides standards for certifying as to the nonavailability of domestic workers before Mexican workers may be admitted, clause (1) of this section requires certification that sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified, are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed. It seems to me that this clause is merely intended to apply a rule of reasonable availability, taking into consideration all the circumstances existing at the time of certification.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. They might not have been there in March, but they might be available at harvesttime, and if they were available by harvesttime, then the Department of Labor could not certify that there was a lack of workers, because the domestic workers would be there: Is not that the chairman's understanding?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the meaning of that language, as I interpret it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the committee have available the report of the study made by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, as prepared and issued under the supervision of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. He used the following language:

Unemployment among these marginal farmers is depriving the Nation of the equivalent of more than 2,500,000 workers—



Referring to farm workers. Did the committee have that information?

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will speak for itself, but as I recall, that report was thoroughly discussed by a witness who appeared before the committee. I may say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that, in view of the fact that we had before us another bill which covered both foreign and domestic labor, the first question we decided was whether we should deal with foreign labor alone, or both foreign labor and domestic labor, including offshore labor from our Territorial possessions, such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The committee members present were unanimous in their decision to deal with the Mexican problem solely. The reason for that decision is that we are confronted with a special condition with respect to the importation of labor from Mexico. The Government of Mexico has notified our Government that it will terminate the agreement with respect to the importation of Mexican labor into this country, and that it will not agree to a program comparable to the one under which we import workers from the Bahamas and other islands under British control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question on that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If there is not available sufficient domestic farm labor, that is, American citizens, to serve the purpose, what would we lose if we did not make an agreement with any foreign nation?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that that is a question for the administrator of this bill, if it shall be enacted, to determine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just read, and I think the language is specific, the rules and regulations under which the administrator of this bill must proceed and the conditions that must exist before Mexican labor is permitted to enter the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My reason for asking questions is that I desire that what we do may be agreeable to our neighbors, but I also want to see that American labor is taken care of. Is it not a fact that the only reason for this proposed legislation is that it is necessary in order to get labor for the farmer?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the purposes, yes, and the chief source of foreign labor in this hemisphere is Mexico. That has been the case heretofore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But should not the chief source of supply be American labor?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and also for a brief comment on the remark of the able Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. All of us are interested in domestic labor and desire to give citi-

zens of the United States the opportunity to work if they are available. We certainly would not want to give a job to a foreigner at the expense of an American citizen. But I must call the attention of the very able Senator from New Mexico to the fact that there is certain work which must be performed in the harvesting of root crops, such as sugar beets and potatoes which involves what is called "stoop" labor. It is the kind of work which is most tedious. If a job of that kind were offered to the average American worker, under present conditions, when factories and the employers in every other field are bidding for workers, he would take the job which was far more pleasant than the stoop labor required in digging potatoes, or topping sugar beets, or thinning sugar beets, or working in the cotton fields.

It is for that reason that those of us who listened to the testimony in the committee hearings came to a realization and a complete understanding of what faces the producer. We should enact some type of law which will permit the bringing in of Mexican labor or offshore labor, the type of labor willing to work in the beet fields, the onion patches, and fields producing all types of root crops, as well as in the cotton fields. If we do not provide that type of worker, many root and fiber crops will go to waste. The members of the committee recognize that something must be done to relieve the situation.

I know that in the past there have been instances of men looking at a stoop-labor job and saying, "I do not want it." If that kind of a man took such employment, it would be only until he could get something more to his liking. The able Senator from New Mexico knows that as well as do the members of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my good friend from Minnesota that since he has been a Member of the Senate and has been, in a noble way, representing a great State, he has read in the newspapers and in magazines about the suffering of American Indians in New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and in many other places. Only a few minutes ago the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] submitted an amendment which he intends to call up, providing for the employment of Indians.

There is stoop labor in my State. If the Senator from Minnesota will go to the little town of Bluewater during the carrot season he will see Indian laborers there. If they were good enough to lift the American flag at Iwo Jima and to fight in Korea, they are good enough to receive employment.

Mr. THYE. There can be but one answer to the Senator, and that is that he is entirely correct. We should employ every Indian who is willing to accept employment. In my State there are many splendid Indian citizens. I have been with them in the northern and northwestern sections of the State. They are fine people. We want to employ them. We are glad to employ everyone who wants work. But if then we are in need of still more laborers we must employ offshore labor, or the crops will

deteriorate in the fields. That is the whole answer. The bill would permit the employment of Indians, whether they be in Minnesota, in the Dakotas, in New Mexico, or in any other section of the United States. Every citizen who is seeking employment should be employed, but when we exhaust that list and still do not have enough hands to do the work which must be performed, we have got to get labor from offshore.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then the Senator from Minnesota agrees with the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is not a Member of this body who wants to be kinder to Mexico than does the Senator from New Mexico. Possibly a month ago the Senator from Minnesota saw in the Washington Evening Star a picture of an amputee at Walter Reed Hospital. His legs and his right arm had been removed. He was a Puerto Rican. Eighty thousand Puerto Ricans fought in the Second World War. Some Puerto Ricans are dying in Korea. Every military cemetery throughout the world contains bodies of Puerto Ricans. More than 50 years ago we took them into our country, possibly against their desires at the time. But why should they not have a little preference? If they are not available, and if Indian labor is not available—and I think I can show the Senate before we get through that there is available plenty of American labor of every type and kind—I would be in favor of the importation of labor, as provided for in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to say to my good friend from New Mexico that if Indians are available, he need not fear that they will not be given an opportunity to work. As long as domestic labor is available, certification cannot be made for the importation of Mexican labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that it is not the intent of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discriminate in any way against the employment of American labor, including Indians. But the question arose as to whether the recruitment and employment of available American labor should be included in a bill which would authorize recruitment and arrangements to employ Mexican labor. I am sure the committee felt that when and if available, American labor should be employed. However, there were complications involved in including the recruitment of American labor along with Mexican labor. For instance, Mexican labor is not entitled to any social-security benefits, whereas domestic labor is so entitled.

The State Department recently concluded an agreement with the Mexican Government which would provide for the recruitment of Mexican labor under the supervision of the two Governments. It appeared necessary to provide legislation to put that agreement into effect. Therefore, the committee decided to restrict this bill so as to cover the Mexican situation alone. But, as one member of the committee, I desire to say that I would gladly consider any proposal

which would provide for recruiting and employing American labor.

If there should happen to be a surplus of labor in Maine, which probably will not occur, and if a shortage of labor should occur in southern California, I would not agree to recruit labor in Maine to send to southern California, because it would not make sense, particularly in view of the fact that labor in Maine probably would not like the type of work to be found in southern California. I think we should employ American labor to the fullest extent before looking outside our borders. On the other hand, I feel that the State Department, having made the agreement with the Government of Mexico, should have legislation which would implement the agreement and make it possible to put it into effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to state to my good friend from New Mexico that had the committee held the hearings which would be necessary to carry out what the Senator is now advocating, I doubt if we would be through with the hearings at this time. In other words, in order to be able to continue the employment of Mexican labor, it is absolutely necessary that this bill be enacted. We are now operating under an agreement which was made between our Government and the Mexican Government in August 1949. That agreement will expire on June 30 and a new agreement will not be entered into unless the bill which we are now discussing is enacted.

For that reason the committee thought it wise to restrict the provisions of the bill to Mexico. If the emergency should become worse, I believe we should deal not only with farm labor, but with industrial labor. In such event, it is my considered judgment that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and not the Committee on Agriculture should consider remedial legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make another observation along the line suggested by the Senator from Louisiana. I am certain that no one is questioning either the integrity of the committee or the motives behind the action taken by the committee. My concern is engendered by the fact that only last week, in the hearings on appropriations for the Department of Labor witnesses of the service which generally deals with such class of labor testified before the subcommittee that very little or nothing at all had been done with reference to ascertaining what the availability of labor was in the United States. It was an astounding statement. For that reason I am concerned about the bill. It is not that I do not want to go along with the fine idea presented by the Senator from Louisiana and the committee, of trying to fulfill our obligations and our commitments to a friendly foreign nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend that, as he well knows, we have been utilizing foreign labor for many years. The committee decided not to change the present method of deal-

ing with labor from other foreign sources, such as Jamaica and Canada.

The Mexican Government, however, has advised that under no conditions would it continue the present program beyond June 30, 1951, and that it would enter into a new agreement only if it included the main provisions of the tentative agreement entered into by our Government and Mexico this year. That is what we are up against. The evidence is ample that we will need Mexican labor, particularly in the cotton fields of California, Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, and other Southern States. It is imperative that we get that labor at an early date. There is no doubt in my mind that the Mexican Government will not change its views on terminating the present international agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It may be of interest to the Senator from New Mexico to know that the junior Senator from Minnesota intends to offer an amendment which pertains to the point he raised a moment ago. I think the amendment is in accord with the philosophy expressed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. My amendment reads:

On page 4, line 18, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract American workers for such employment at terms and conditions of employment comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

I intend to offer the amendment. In that way the committee bill would expressly state that there must first have been an effort made to recruit American workers.

I also intend to offer an amendment which reads:

On page 4, line 13, after the word "who", insert a comma and the words: "at the prevailing wage rates and other conditions of employment for such area."

The amendments would provide two additional safeguards.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean the prevailing wage rate of the American worker or of the Mexican worker?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the American worker.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly I misunderstood the Senator. I was under the impression he said that the conditions to be imposed upon the American laborer would be the conditions under which the foreign laborer was working.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the Senator from New Mexico that under the terms of the bill, with the many compensations in the form of health services, insurance, and so forth, actually, the Mexican worker may have the opportunity of getting a better deal than the domestic worker in the form of guarantees.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly that is the reason why I am objecting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say conditions should be comparable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should hate to have an American laborer—and when I say

an American I mean an American, regardless of what his background, nationality, or religious belief may be—work for what some of the starving Mexicans work for. I am against that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think after the Senator from New Mexico has had an opportunity to hear a full explanation of the amendments he will be an ardent supporter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to remind my good friend from New Mexico that the bill specifically provides that after the Mexican laborer is transported to a reception center in the United States he would enter into an agreement with an employer. He can bargain for such working conditions as he desires.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As between—

Mr. ELLENDER. As between an employer in this country and the worker from Mexico. A contract would be entered into between them. I believe the Senator has read recent articles with respect to conditions that exist in Texas and other States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know of them from my own knowledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows, I am sure, the reason these conditions exist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. The difficulty has been that many Mexicans came into the United States illegally. They came across the Rio Grande. When they went to a farm to work, the farmer said to them, "Now, listen, unless you work for certain wages or under certain conditions, I will report you and you will have to return to Mexico."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That has happened.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. This bill would discourage that practice. The bill would make it obligatory that contracts entered into in the future between American employers and Mexican laborers shall be with Mexican nationals who enter this country legally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator wants to do the right thing. However, in what position does he think a poor starving Mexican laborer would be in making a contract with the owner of 2,000 acres of cotton in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision in the bill under which associations of employers could employ a group of Mexican laborers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In other words, it provides for fair-employment practices?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be up to the two groups. In other words, what we have tried to do is to make it possible for Mexican laborers to be employed in groups and for them to select employers for whom they desire to work and to select the kind of work they desire to perform. That is one of the provisions in the bill. As I have stated, it is in accord with the understanding which was reached between our Government and the Government of Mexico in Mexico City during the latter part of January and early part of February of this year.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the agreement, considered with the bill, require



that any such foreign labor be paid going wages within the area, in addition to having the right which comes from competitive bidding for services?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I so stated in my opening remarks.

Mr. President, section 504 provides that workers recruited in Mexico shall be admitted to the United States subject to the immigration laws, and that no penalty bond shall be required which imposes liability upon any person for the failure of any such worker to depart from the United States upon termination of employment. Section 504 also provides that workers already in the country and who otherwise would be eligible for admission to the United States may remain to accept agricultural employment pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Should not the word "legally" also be used in that same section? They must be here legally before they can remain.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] have proposed such amendments. The committee agreed to an amendment in section 501 to the effect that the Mexican laborer must have entered this country legally in order to be eligible for employment.

Mr. President, section 505 exempts agricultural workers imported from Mexico from social security benefits and taxes, and withholding of, or payment of, such taxes by the employers of such workers. The section further provides that such workers shall not be subject to the head tax levied under section 2 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

Section 506 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to utilize the facilities and services of other Federal and State agencies as may be agreed upon, to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and to cooperate with the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements or arrangements relating to the importation of agricultural workers from Mexico.

Section 507, as amended, defines the agricultural employment for which workers can be recruited as that covered by section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended. Section 507 also defines "employer" to include an association or group of employers.

In other words, those two references to the Fair Labor Standards Act and to the Internal Revenue Code provisions, make the bill apply strictly to agricultural labor. As may be recalled, and as I shall indicate in a moment, efforts were made to enlarge the definition to include the canning of agricultural commodities, the ginning and compressing of cotton, and other related work. As I shall show in a few moments the committee deemed it advisable to delete such provisions from the bill.

Section 508 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General to permit the importation of workers from any other country for agricultural employment, pursuant to the immigration laws, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for employment on farms.

Section 509 provides that the program of importing foreign agricultural workers, as authorized by the act, shall terminate December 31, 1952.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would it not have been better if the committee had considered the bill—which I know is important—from the long-range standpoint? Is not this merely a temporary makeshift idea to try to help out during one season?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not. The sole purpose is to deal with the Mexican problem. We have been importing labor from Mexico, as the Senator knows, for many years. Because of the seriousness of the wetback problem, the Mexican Government has decided that in the future, unless legislation of the character we are now proposing is enacted, no more Mexican labor will be contracted for work in this country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is the case, why limit the bill to such a short period of time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would be willing to make the time longer, but the committee agreed to limit the legislation to the period indicated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What is the expiration date?

Mr. ELLENDER. December 31, 1952.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is the reason for the committee amendment in section 508, providing that nothing in this act shall be construed—

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my next point. I shall reach that in a moment.

Mr. CASE. My purpose in raising the question is this: Apparently there is some reason for saying that nothing in this act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General under the general immigration laws. I was wondering whether the same logic would also suggest that we should say that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Displaced Persons Act, or to limit the authority of the Displaced Persons Commission to bring displaced persons here for agricultural employment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Personally I do not believe that such language is necessary, but it does no harm. There were some who thought that unless we put language of that character in the bill it might suggest to the Attorney General or to some other department of Government that it was not intended to continue the method now in vogue for recruiting labor on a temporary basis from Canada, from the Bahamas, and from other offshore islands under the British flag.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the distinguished Senator is familiar with the fact

that the law relating to the Displaced Persons Commission definitely contemplates the entry of certain persons for agricultural employment. The same logic which would say that we should guard this bill against misinterpretation in relation to the general immigration laws and the authority of the Attorney General would also suggest that we should say that it is not intended to interfere with the operation of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that Senate bill 984 provides that the employer shall pay the prevailing rate of wages in the area of employment to laborers coming from Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not specifically provided. However, as I indicated a while ago during the course of my argument, the contract is to be made between the employer and the Mexican laborer himself. The contract is not between government and government but it is between employer and employee.

From the evidence which I heard in Mexico City, the Mexican laborer who comes into the United States legally usually sees to it that he gets as much as anyone else obtains at the place where he works. As a matter of fact, those are among the first questions asked—"What kind of work have you? How much are you going to pay me? How much do you pay others?" Certainly, in entering into contracts with employers, they have insisted upon receiving at least what the employers pay other employees in the particular locality.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. I misunderstood him. I thought he had stated that that provision was actually contained in the bill itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from New York that I have before me a sample individual work contract. It reads in part as follows:

4. Payment of wages. The employer shall pay the worker the prevailing wage rate paid to domestic agricultural workers for similar work, and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or the rate specified on the last page of this contract, whichever is the greater. Where higher wages are paid for specialized tasks, such as the operation of vehicles or machinery, Mexican workers shall be paid such wages while assigned to such tasks.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I made inquiry of the Senator a few moments ago with reference to this matter. At that time I asked him whether or not that was a requirement found in the composite bill, the discussions with the Mexican Government, and the requirements of the Mexican Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I may have misunderstood my distinguished friend's question.

Mr. CORDON. I thought it was understood; and I was in entire agreement with the answer. Are those the facts?

Mr. ELLENDER. Those are the facts.

Mr. CORDON. Those are the three operations to cover the requirement for payment of going wages in the area where the Mexican national is to be employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The contract requires that the prevailing wage rates in the area be the minimum wage and in turn the bill guarantees payment by the producer of wages he contracted to pay.

Mr. CORDON. If that sort of an agreement is not signed, then the Mexican Government is not agreeable to its citizens coming to the United States to be employed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is one of the conditions to be imposed.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I ask the indulgence of the Senate to discuss the amendments recommended by the committee. It will be noted that in section 501, on page 1, line 9, we struck from the bill the provision which deals with other countries. The purpose of that amendment is simply to make the bill applicable only to the Republic of Mexico. It eliminates all other countries in the Western Hemisphere, as well as Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

In the same section, on page 2, lines 5 and 6, will be found an amendment which inserts the words "under legal entry" after the words "United States." That amendment provides that Mexicans already in the United States can be recruited under this program only if they entered the country legally. This amendment would prevent the utilization of any wet backs in the program and would discourage such illegal immigration.

The third committee amendment is on page 3, in section 502, beginning in line 15. It provides that the employer shall reimburse the United States for expenses incurred by the Government only for transportation and subsistence of workers in amounts not to exceed \$20 per worker, instead of requiring reimbursement for administrative costs of recruiting as well as transportation and subsistence payments. It was the thought of some members of the committee that we should make certain that the costs of the regularly paid employees of the Government should not be included; therefore, this particular portion of the bill was amended so as to make provision for reimbursement for "essential expenses, not including salaries or expenses of regular department of agency personnel, incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed \$20 per worker."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, this requirement of the employer applies only to such sums as have been spent by the United States, in addition to the regular expenses of the Labor Department in connection with this entire enterprise.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. I may state to my good friend from Utah that in the committee some members wanted to reduce that sum from \$20 to \$10, but we obtained estimates from the Department of Labor that the cost of this service might be more than \$20. It may be as much as \$35 if it is necessary to transport them an average of 500 miles. But what we are trying to do is to make the employer bear practically all the expenses of this operation. Under the agreements now existing, as I have heretofore stated, the employer must go into Mexico to enter into his contract. He has to travel to Monterrey or other cities within the Republic of Mexico, and there contract for his workers and transport them to the place of employment.

The Mexican Government was violently opposed to that procedure for this reason. Mexico is now engaged in developing her resources on an extensive scale. Her mines are being worked, and agriculture is on the boom. Most of the labor that was recruited by Texas and other States came from the northern part of Mexico. The Mexican Government is anxious that some of the laborers away from the border be utilized, those around Mexico City, for example. There may be quite a number of Mexicans out of employment there. As I have pointed out, the Mexican Government has gone so far as to agree to establish recruitment centers within the Republic of Mexico and to pay the cost of transporting laborers to those centers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Recruiting.

Mr. ELLENDER. Recruitment centers, that is correct. And the Mexican Government is not only to pay for the cost of transportation to the recruiting centers, but also is to pay for the food and utilities necessary to take care of the laborers until they are examined by our immigration officials, by health officials, and until it has been decided that the applicants are eligible under our laws to work in the United States. Our Government agrees to furnish the transportation from those centers to a reception center established on the border in the United States, but it can charge the employer up to \$20 per worker for that service.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. At what point do the Mexican laborers enter into the agreement? In Mexico, or at the receiving center in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. At the reception center in our country.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, no contractor or employer will have to go into Mexico in the future to make a contract?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That was one of the objections made by employers in the United States. They had to go into Mexico, and some of them had to go quite far inland in order to obtain workers. In some cases the trip was rather costly. They also had a little difficulty, as I was informed, with some of the officials in obtaining the number of workers they desired, and in making other necessary arrangements.

It was the desire of the employers of this country to try to arrange for a method by which the contracts could be entered into in the United States. For this reason we have provided under the bill that reception centers be established in the United States near the border where employers will enter into contracts with Mexican workers.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. If the contracts are entered into there, I take it the Government assumes no further responsibility, so far as the worker is concerned, in getting him to the job or seeing that he actually remains on the job when he gets to it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct in that the Government does not guarantee compliance by the worker with the individual work contract.

Mr. WATKINS. Even though the man may work only 1 day, the employer will be responsible for paying up to \$20?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Irrespective of the fact that he works only 1 day?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The employer not only assumes the cost up to \$20 per capita, as imposed by the bill, but all expenses from the center in the United States to the place of employment.

Mr. WATKINS. That is, provided the employees are taken at the border. Of course, I understand most of the farmers in my State, in Idaho, Colorado, and other States north of New Mexico and Arizona, and probably Texas, are very much dissatisfied with the provision placing the reception centers at the border. They want them located at some central place in their own State. They think the provision is distinctly unfair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that. The committee gave consideration to that matter and decided unanimously not to include such a provision.

Mr. WATKINS. What were the reasons?

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal for local centers was made by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who was desirous of having a center established in Washington. If we were to do that, we would have to establish other centers in, let us say, Memphis, Tenn., or in Colorado, Minnesota, and elsewhere in the United States; and that would involve a tremendous cost which would have to be borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me ask this question in connection with that point, please: Is there any practical situation which would require the establishment of a center at Memphis, Tenn., and the establishment of a center in Minnesota? I understand that very few of the Mexican laborers will be needed in States other than the States near the Mexican border. I have inquired of other Senators about that, and I cannot find that there will be need for Mexican laborers at other points in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Utah is misinformed.



if he believes that only Washington and Oregon and Utah desire local centers. If we establish a reception center in the Northwest we shall have to do the same thing in respect to other States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why not?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, why not—in the first place?

But in the second place, this Mexican labor will not be made available to Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and other States removed from the border, because the farmers in those States simply cannot stand the extra cost. Therefore, they will simply have to forget about using such labor. I have already heard from the farm bureau in my State that the farmers there cannot stand the added expense, and thus such Mexican labor will be of no use to them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Representatives of the Farm Bureau appeared before the committee and took the position that under no circumstances or condition did they want or expect a subsidy from the Federal Government in connection with this matter. The representatives of the Farm Bureau were unanimous in that regard. I do not know of any farm organization, except the Farmers Union, as I recall, which asked that the Federal Government underwrite an expensive farm labor program.

I wish to say to my distinguished friends that the committee took the position that the farmers should and, judging from the evidence, they are willing in most instances, to pay these expenses, rather than to place the burden on the Federal Government.

According to some of the witnesses at the hearings, the Government should not only establish reception centers in various parts of the country but it should also provide for transportation of domestic as well as foreign workers. I produced evidence to show that during World War II the Government spent more than \$30,000,000 a year in order to take care of these centers.

Mr. WATKINS. But during World War II all kinds of subsidies were paid—to almost everyone. That was done because of the tremendous desire for the production of food.

Today there is a similar desire. However, if the cost of this labor is made prohibitive, it will not be used, and thus food will not be produced on farms which otherwise would use this labor. I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would say that at the present time the farmers, in general, are in good financial condition. Inasmuch as the great majority of the farmers have expressed a willingness to pay for the transportation and other costs of the workers covered by this bill, it is obvious that they do not want any subsidy in that connection, and are willing to have this bill enacted in the form in which it has been reported by the committee.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I happen to know, for instance, that the row-crop farmers, the sugar-beet farmers, the fruit

growers, and other farmers in Utah and in the surrounding States who use large numbers of Mexican laborers are not in such a very prosperous condition. In the first place, the farmers in most of those areas have not had a crop of fruit for 2 years. Today their position is such that if they were actually to give away, free, without cost, the fruit to the buyers, and say to them, "Here is fruit; we give it to you and we will pay for the packaging of it" the cost of the fruit still would be prohibitive because of the freight rates and other costs involved, which in the end would make the fruit too expensive for the consumers to use.

Therefore, Mr. President, anything that is done to add to the present burden of those farmers, with the result that they will be put in a position in which they cannot compete with the growers in Texas and other States located at or near the border, will certainly be to the serious disadvantage of the farmers of whom I am speaking, and will also be to the serious disadvantage of the United States as a whole.

Certainly not all the farmers in the United States are in good condition today; in fact, many of them are decidedly not in good condition.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said that I was speaking of farmers generally.

Mr. WATKINS. In the areas where wheat is grown and where subsidies are paid in that connection, the farmers may be in good condition today; but no fruit farmer has received a subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to my friend that with respect to the establishment of reception centers, Mr. Baird of Indianola, Miss., was one of the witnesses who testified. He represented the agricultural labor users of the United States at the hearings. He was opposed to the establishment of centers other than on the Mexican border. Many joined him in saying, "If you establish recruitment centers in other areas of the country, we shall want some established in Mississippi, Tennessee, Florida, and other States." That is the situation with which the committee was confronted.

Of course, if the distinguished Senator wants to subsidize this program by having the Federal Government pay all the expenses involved, he will have an opportunity, I suppose, to vote to have that done, because I understand that some amendments to that effect will be offered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not asking for a lot of subsidies; but if it is desired to have sufficient amounts of food produced, sufficient labor will have to be made available to the farmers on a basis on which they can use it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what we are attempting to do.

Mr. WATKINS. If the cost of the labor is prohibitive, it will be necessary for us to notify the farmers who in the past have been dependent on Mexican labor, "Just forget all about it; there is no use in spraying your fruit trees or in planting row crops," because those farmers simply cannot bear any extra expense. Many of them have lost heavily on their row crops in the past 2 years, anyway.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me point out to the distinguished Senator from Utah that for the past 3 or 4 years I have heard no complaints; the farmers have been paying all these expenses for the transportation of Mexican laborers from their homes to the places of employment in the United States. Under present legislation the farmers have had to do that recruiting themselves, and at their own expense.

In this bill we provide that the recruitment will be done by the Federal Government, and the employer will go to the centers established by the United States, to do the contracting.

As I have said, the method provided in the bill in that connection is not at all different from the method which has been employed in the past in the case of those expenses, because in the past the farmers who have employed that labor have borne all the expenses.

This bill seeks to make certain that the bulk of the cost will be borne by the employers who need the Mexican labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In view of what the Senator from Louisiana has just said, does not he agree that the employers who are within 5 minutes' distance of the Mexican labor will be the only beneficiaries of this measure? Should not legislation be beneficial to the entire United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my good friend that that has not been the case in the past.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I beg to differ with the able Senator; it has been the case in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have evidence to show that farmers came from Mississippi and Arkansas and Tennessee and many other States, into Mexico, where they recruited labor, bringing the labor to their own farms, and paying all the expenses to and from Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But is it not true that along the Mexican border, from Brownsville, Tex., on the Gulf of Mexico, through New Mexico and Arizona, and to the Pacific in California, there will be an advantage?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It takes only about 3 hours for a worker to come from Juarez, Mexico, to New Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, that is an advantage created by nature. Those people reside near the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Should the law be designed to protect only those who are protected by nature? Should we not have a general law which will protect all our citizens?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say that, as the Senator knows, we do not try to do that in other legislation. Certain States, as the Senator knows, may possess advantages over certain other States, yet all their citizens live under the same law.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. A few moments ago the Senator from Louisiana referred to the fact that during World War II the

Federal Government aided farmers by paying the transportation costs of farm workers. Is it not also true that during the years of World War II the Federal Government paid for the transportation of industrial workers from the east coast and from various other sections of the country to the west coast, where they were to work in the shipyards, thereby, and to that extent, subsidizing those industries? And does that not show in effect that agriculture was not receiving any particular consideration from the Government, or consideration which was not likewise extended to other industries?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct as to that. As I indicated a while ago, I am in agreement with my good friend from New Mexico that it may be that this problem should be studied further. It may be necessary, if conditions abroad do not improve, to do again the very thing that was done before; but I beseech my good friends here not to delay the passage of the pending bill by trying to incorporate in it a program which is entirely different from the one we are now debating. I urge that we pass the bill with a view to continuing the cordial relationship which now exists between our country and the Republic of Mexico. If the pending bill is not passed it will simply mean that the only way by which Mexican labor may come into this country will be for the Mexican workers to swim the Rio Grande. That, too, would be very distasteful to the Mexican people and to the Mexican Government. They urge that a bill of the kind which is now before the Senate be enacted. That is why I am pleading with Senators not to offer amendments to the bill which would remove it from the purview of the tentative agreement which was made between our Government and the Republic of Mexico. I have endeavored to have the bill drafted with that in view. We worked quite a long time in order to get the bill to conform as nearly as possible to the provisions of the agreement which was reached in Mexico City.

I took it upon myself to cooperate, so far as possible, with the House committee which will handle similar legislation in the House. Representative POAGE, from Texas, was in Mexico City when I was there and is familiar with all that transpired at the conferences. We discussed the problem before I introduced the pending bill, and before he introduced the bill in the House, in order that the two bills might be as nearly alike as possible, with a view to carrying out the agreements which were entered into in Mexico City.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Why should we support a measure which is going to be absolutely useless to our people? If the Senator will recall, our people bear the extra expense. Mind you, they must take care of the \$20 a head for each person they get. Whether he works a day or not, they must do that anyway. In addition, they are required to pay his transportation to and from the border.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator has often voted in the Senate for

bills which did not affect his State very greatly. I cite the fact that, for example, cotton is not grown in Idaho or in other Northern States, yet Senators from those States join with us in providing legislation for the benefit of the cotton farmer.

Mr. WATKINS. At the same time, the Senator was voting to protect the Idaho potato grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator did not overlook that.

Mr. ELLENDER. We cannot possibly have a legislative pattern here which will meet the requirements of all the States. As a good lawyer, the Senator understands that. What we are trying to do, I repeat, is to enact legislation which will conform as nearly as possible to the agreement reached between Mexico and our Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the Senator will yield for a question along this very line.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think all Senators will agree that it is very laudable to try to observe our agreements with a foreign country, but in carrying out the agreement with Mexico, for example, and in trying to comply with it, does not the Senator agree with me that it seems to be consistent, at the same time, not to do anything which would be detrimental to our own citizens, whether they be laborers or whether they be farmers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am unable to agree with the Senator that we are doing anything detrimental to our own citizens. I, for one, would not stand for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator agrees with me, does he not, that the benefits in this instance will accrue to those along the Mexican border, and will not accrue to the citizens of Idaho, for example?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I thought the Senator had in mind our domestic workers, not the employers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I refer to both the workers and the employers. They are all citizens. In this instance, so far as benefits which are to be derived by the employers are concerned, those benefits will accrue principally to employers along the Mexican border, will they not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That has not been the case, as I pointed out. The evidence is contrary to that statement. There were any number of farmers from Idaho, Minnesota, and Oregon, for example, who were employing Mexican labor, and who, under the agreement which is now in existence, paid all transportation and other incidental expenses.

Mr. WATKINS. They did not have to pay the Government in addition to that, did they?

Mr. ELLENDER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WATKINS. They did not have to pay the Government \$20 a head in addition to that, did they?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but they had to go into Mexico to get their labor. The contemplation is that the workers will be brought to the border, and the \$20 charge is to offset the average cost to the Government of transporting the Mexican laborers to the border and return.

Mr. WATKINS. I may point out to the Senator that part of what he has said may actually be true in certain of the sugar-beet growing sections, because the sugar companies, in order to obtain the contracts with workers, have had to assume a great deal of that cost. They have made the contracts in Mexico, and they have brought the laborers into the United States, where they have permitted the farmers to use them on the farms. They were later used at the factories, when the runs were on, after most of the beets had been harvested.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true.

Mr. WATKINS. That, of course, is not directly an expense to the farmer. We have many other farmers, in addition to the sugar-beet farmers, who employ this labor. It is for those people that I am speaking. For instance, in my State there are large numbers of celery growers, who employ a large amount of the kind of help affected by the bill. Also there are the fruit growers and some of the potato growers, and any number of small-farm operators who use this help and are absolutely required to have it. I thought the legislation was designed to help them, as well as to help the people in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. I thought it was going to help them all, but if it is going to make it impossible for us to use that help, it would put us at a competitive disadvantage. Shipping those people into the United States, and keeping them going from place to place, runs into a great deal of money. As I pointed out, many times they stay but a day or two, and then they get other jobs; and they continue that practice. If it is not going to do any good, I do not think I shall vote for what is said to be a general bill to help people of that type; and if it only helps two or three States, I certainly am not going to vote for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I dislike to disagree with my good friend. The Record shows that last year there were 67,421 Mexican laborers under contract. In Arizona there were some 18,000; in Arkansas, there were 5,927; in California, 7,889; in Colorado, 812; in Idaho, 187; in Mississippi, 1,844; in New Mexico, 12,918; in Texas, 29,105.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator have the figures for Utah?

Mr. ELLENDER. None were contracted for employment in Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right.

Mr. WATKINS. There was no fruit crop, for one reason. It was frozen out.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is possibly the reason.

Mr. WATKINS. The situation which we are now facing in Utah is different from the situation which existed a year ago. There were some of our farm boys left on the farm, but now they are being taken into the service. Many boys have been taken from the farms, and there is a desperate situation. We shall probably have to call on foreign labor this year to take care of the fruit crop, the sugar-beet crop, and other crops which are coming along. For that reason, I am making a plea to the Senate to make this bill workable so that we can get a



sufficient supply of labor to assure adequate provision of food for the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is willing to undertake at this time to establish a subsidy program, that is for him to decide. But the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discussed the question at several meetings—

Mr. WATKINS. Why not fix the amount the Government is to pay, and then let Texas and all the rest of the States involved help take care of the cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. What the committee tried to do was to let the burden be carried by the farmers and not by the Federal Government. That is how it has been done in the past.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me point out how these matters are handled in irrigation States. In Utah there is a canal 25 miles in length. Obviously, the man at the head of the canal takes his water out and has very little expense. If he were required to pay only the expense of getting the water to him, it would be a very easy situation. What we do is to require every man to pay his share of the bill. All pay on substantially the same basis. The man who is 25 miles away pays the same assessment as does the man at the head of the canal. If the canal is too long, it is possibly cut into two divisions, but the man at the upper end knows he must help carry the whole burden, so they will all be on the same competitive basis. It seems to me that is a fair principle. We are used to that in the far West.

Mr. ELLENDER. I imagine that if the principle advocated by my distinguished friend were carried out, we would hear a lot of squawking from the farmers. Some of this labor comes from Puerto Rico and the Bahamas.

Mr. WATKINS. That does not apply to this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. But if we are to be fair, we must take care of the States on the Atlantic coast which now contract for labor from Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Canada.

Mr. WATKINS. The cost of water transportation, and similar costs, would about even up the expenses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Today employers who need workers in Florida, in New Jersey, or, in fact, in any of the Atlantic States, deal directly with workers from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Puerto Rico. At present they pay for part of the cost of recruitment and the expense of transportation and the worker pays the remaining part.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that for seasonal work, such as farm operation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. What the employers do in States such as Florida or any other of the Atlantic Coast States is to go to the United States Employment Service and obtain a certificate showing that labor is not available to carry on the necessary farm work. With that certification they go to foreign governments and a contract is entered into between the employers in this country and workers in the Bahamas or in Jamaica, for illustration. Bonds are posted by the employer, and the worker then comes to this country for seasonal employment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the RECORD should show that farmers on the eastern seaboard who have been accustomed to using labor from the islands offshore do not ask to be included in this bill. They are perfectly satisfied with the arrangement which they have, and they do not want any Government supervision. They make their own arrangements and are happy with them. They said they were not concerned about being included in the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. But I am sure the Senator is aware that if we should decide to subsidize the transportation of Mexican labor or domestic labor, we would be asked to subsidize the transportation of labor from the islands to this country. If we ever start that, there is no telling where it will end.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What was done in that regard during World War II?

Mr. ELLENDER. There was an extensive subsidization program at that time. If the Senate is desirous of entering into a subsidization program, it is for the Senate to decide.

Mr. WATKINS. What did the employers on the Atlantic seaboard do?

Mr. ELLENDER. They got the necessary help. The Senator from Iowa has suggested that they are desirous of being excluded from the provisions of the bill because of the friendly relationship they have with the governments of Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and the Bahamas. They do not want the situation disturbed, and they ask to be excluded from the bill, as the Senator just stated. But I am saying that if the Senate should decide to subsidize the transportation of Mexican and domestic labor, they will want to come under the terms of the bill. And if the employers will not want it, you can be sure the representatives of the workers will demand inclusion.

Mr. WATKINS. In most of the Mountain States we would not be asking for any help if the Government would let us alone. There has got to be some equalization somewhere in order to live.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it were not for the emergency—

Mr. WATKINS. And that emergency is almost perpetual.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it were not for the emergency, we would not have to deal with this bill at this time. As I have stated, the Mexican Government will terminate the present agreement June 30 and it is imperative that some program of importing agricultural workers from Mexico be continued in order to supply necessary farm labor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator says that if Mexican labor were subsidized, possibly labor from Jamaica would ask for the same thing. I do not consider Puerto Rican labor in the same situation with Mexican or Jamaican labor. The way to

correct the situation, so as not to subsidize, is to utilize all our American labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending bill provides that we shall have to use American labor before we can import Mexican labor. I hope the bill, if it is enacted, will be administered to that end.

Mr. President, the fourth amendment section 502, page 4, beginning on line 2, provides that in the case of a worker leaving his place of employment before termination of the contract period, the employer would pay an amount determined by the Secretary of Labor to be equivalent to the normal cost of returning other workers from the place of employment to the reception center only if the worker were apprehended within the United States. The bill as introduced would have required such reimbursement regardless of whether the worker was apprehended or not. In addition, the language has been clarified to avoid the interpretation that the employer would have to pay the costs of apprehension.

The committee received testimony to the effect that under the present program, some of the bonds executed by employers have been forfeited notwithstanding the fact that the Mexican laborers involved had returned voluntarily to the Republic of Mexico.

The fifth amendment, dealing with section 504, at page 4, beginning on line 23, provides that Mexicans already in the United States and eligible for recruitment can be recontracted under the program pursuant to arrangements between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, it is understood that the word "legal" is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. "Under legal entry." That is correct. Two amendments to that effect are pending. One was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. The other amendment was submitted by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. Personally I do not believe that it is necessary to amend the bill in that respect, for the reason that in order for such Mexicans to remain in the country it would be necessary to obtain the consent of the Mexican Government. I am positive that with respect to Mexican labor which came into the country illegally, the consent of the Mexican Government could not be obtained. However, I am willing to accept an amendment to make it certain that only those who entered legally can be recontracted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think that in order to carry out the purposes of the bill and in order to protect a man who enters legally and is recruited for work, a provision should be written into the bill which would compel the Immigration Bureau to deport the persons who were in the country illegally, because they would be competing against those who were in the country legally?

Mr. ELLENDER. The records show that during last year possibly more than a million Mexicans entered the United

States illegally. More than 500,000 of them were returned to Mexico by the Immigration Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That leaves 500,000 to compete with the ones who had come in legally.

Mr. ELLENDER. What we are trying to do is to provide that an employer may not employ any Mexican laborer who did not enter the country legally. If there is any other language which the Senator can suggest in order to make the provision stronger, I would cheerfully consider it. As I pointed out a little while ago, the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall "recruit such workers—including any such workers temporarily in the United States under legal entry."

The amendment which I have been discussing would be at page 4 in section 504. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has suggested that the word "already" be stricken and the word "legally" be inserted. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has suggested that the language be "by virtue of legal entry."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I prefer the language suggested by the Senator from Minnesota to that suggested by the Senator from New Mexico. I think it would make it plainer, and it would be more in accord with the language which we have included in section 501 on page 2.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We discussed the subject, and we both have the same objective. My amendment is basically a refining amendment, and its purpose is to tighten up the language.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I think I convinced an official of the Department of Labor that such language would be superfluous, because as to Mexican employees it would be necessary to obtain the consent of the Mexican Government. Certainly the Mexican Government would not consent to the employment of Mexicans who had entered the United States illegally. That is the very thing that the Mexican Government is fighting; they are fighting against the wet-back problem. That is why they are insistent on making it positive and certain that under no conditions shall employers be permitted to hire Mexicans who entered the United States illegally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know what the Senator's objectives are. It was my purpose, in offering the amendment, to tighten up the provisions and to tie down the language so that there could be no doubt about it in anyone's mind.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, I shall not object to that being done. I want to carry out the intention of the bill as I understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator, between now and tomorrow, will look over one of the amendments which I have submitted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I have all of the Senator's amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The one that refers to this particular section is lettered "I."

Mr. ELLENDER. I have them all, and I shall look them over tonight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the amendment which deals with the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know I shall have some time this evening to look them all over.

The sixth amendment, being to section 507, page 6, beginning at line 17, strikes out—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I inquire how much longer the Senator will take?

Mr. ELLENDER. Four minutes. I should like to complete my statement. I assure the Senator that if I am not interrupted any more, although I do not mind being interrupted, I shall be able to conclude in 4 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if hoping will help the Senator, I hope he will not be disturbed.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sixth amendment strikes out the addition of horticultural employment, cotton ginning and compressing, crushing of oil seeds, and the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonal agricultural products in the definition of agricultural employment. The amendment restricts the use of Mexican laborers to the work defined as agricultural employment in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD definitions of "agricultural employment," as contained in the two references.

There being no objection, the definition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act:

"'Agriculture' includes farming in all its branches and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil; dairying; the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 114j (g) of title 12; the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry; and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage, or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

Section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code:

"The term 'agricultural labor' includes all services performed—

(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I ask a short question of the Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It generally refers to field labor?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The committee has deleted from the bill the language to which I have referred, namely, with respect to packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Any processing?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The seventh amendment, dealing with section 507, page 6, beginning on line 21, provides that the Secretary of Labor shall enter into an agreement with an association or group of employers only if those of its members for whom workers are being obtained are bound, in the event of its default, to carry out the obligations of the association or group, or if the Secretary determines that such individual liability is not necessary to assure performance of the obligations of the association or group.

The final amendment, which is section 508, on page 7, beginning on line 5, as recommended by the committee, is a new section providing that the act shall not be construed as limiting the authority of the Attorney General to permit the importation of workers from other foreign countries for agricultural employment, pursuant to the general immigration laws, or to permit any such alien who entered the United States legally to remain for employment on farms.

In conclusion, I should like to discuss two aspects of the farm-labor situation in the United States. It is likely that shortages will occur in the supply of farm labor in various parts of the country this year. It would seem to me that how critical the shortages will be depends on a number of imponderables and it is impossible to determine now just how many more workers will be needed. This bill was not designed to provide a farm-labor program to meet widespread emergencies throughout the country. Your committee believes that legislation on that subject should be considered separately and would require further study with respect to the extent to which such a program would be subsidized by the Federal Government. At the same time this bill does provide sources of farm labor to meet critical shortages in those areas which have heretofore utilized workers imported from Mexico. By continuing and strengthening the program of importing workers from Mexico this bill will undoubtedly help in the production of essential food and fiber in those areas.

The problem most often discussed in relation to the farm-labor situation, particularly in the Southwest, is the wet-back problem. I think it should be noted that the bill has been amended to prohibit the utilization of any worker who has entered this country from Mexico illegally. Under the existing agreement wetbacks could be recruited for work in the United States and undoubtedly that provision encouraged further illegal immigration. While the bill does not attempt to solve the problem by imposing additional penalties on employers of wetbacks, it does provide a program



whereby agricultural producers can obtain workers legally. If the bill is not enacted the present international agreement will be terminated and the extensive program of importing farm workers from Mexico will end June 30. I firmly believe it in the interest of the country that the program agreed upon by the Mexican and United States Governments and as authorized by this legislation should be established. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge favorable action on S. 984, as amended.

Mr. President, I wish to state that in order to further assist in connection with the wetback problem, and in conformity with the promise which I made to many members of the Mexican delegation that I would sponsor a bill to make it a punishable offense for an American employer knowingly to employ an alien illegally in this country, such a bill was prepared and introduced by me today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. What objection would there be to offering the bill which the Senator has introduced today as an amendment to the pending bill, to take care of the wetback problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason why I do not believe we ought to consider such a course is that there is such a provision in a bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and that problem is now being considered by the Judiciary Committee.

I do not wish to load down the bill with subject matter which may be more or less foreign to what we are trying to do at the moment and which does not come within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee. I assure my good friend from New Mexico that I shall take the matter up at the first opportunity with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and ask him to consider the bill which I have introduced, separate and apart from the omnibus bill. I am very hopeful that we shall have early action on that bill, and I am hopeful that the Senator will agree with my views, as expressed in that bill, which conforms with the view of many of our friends in Mexico, that the way to deal with the wetback problem is to impose certain restrictions on the employment by corporations or individual employers in this country of aliens illegally in the country, when they hire men whom they know to be illegally in the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am acquainted with the situation from the standpoint of first-hand knowledge. Statements have been made in my presence by persons who are so ruthless that they would prefer to employ a wetback rather than a man entering the country legally, and coming under the provisions of the Senator's bill. Knowing that class of people, I believe that a portion of the bill which the Senator introduced today should be inserted in the pending bill. I shall look it over, and if it is proper, I

shall try to work it out so as to offer it as an amendment.

#### CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Arthur L. Jennings, to be postmaster at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., will be passed over.

#### POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the Chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### GENEVA CONVENTIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF CERTAIN WAR VICTIMS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTIONS OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive D, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field; Executive E, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea; Executive F, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, and Executive G, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a Geneva Convention Relating to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which were open for signature from August 12, 1949, until February 12, 1950, and during that period were signed on behalf of the United States of America and a number of other States. Without objection, the injunctions of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee

on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection. The President's message is as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of each of the following conventions:

(1) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field,

(2) Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick, and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea,

(3) Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War,

(4) Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which were open for signature from August 12, 1949, until February 12, 1950, and during that period were signed on behalf of the United States of America and a number of other states.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, it is requested that the Senate do so subject to the reservation made by the plenipotentiary of the United States in signing the convention, namely:

The United States reserves the right to impose the death penalty in accordance with the provisions of article 68, paragraph 2, without regard to whether the offenses referred to therein are punishable by death under the law of the occupied territory at the time the occupation begins.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The WHITE HOUSE, April 26, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State, with accompanying commentaries; (2) certified copies of Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, for the Protection of War Victims.)

#### RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

##### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

James N. Jensen	Robert B. Black
Joseph N. Gonyeau	William G. Roden
Walter C. Schafran	Sidney F. Hansen

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert L. Smith	Frederick W. Folger
Walter Folger	John V. Caffrey
Frederick O. Wooley	Hollis M. Walker, Jr.
Thomas Osman, Jr.	Henry E. Engelbrecht
Lyle W. Lemos	

## IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

*To be major*

## CHAPLAIN

X Walker, Jared Allen, 18776A.

*To be captains*

## UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Alexander, William George, 15813A.  
 X Algermissen, Robert Louis, 15846A.  
 X Allen, Roy Leon, 15981A.  
 X Allman, Conrad Scott, 15984A.  
 X Almquist, Peter Williams, 18073A.  
 X Anderson, Winston Paine, 15848A.  
 X Anding, Marvin Ellis, 16026A.  
 X Archbold, William Elmer, 16020A.  
 X Armstrong, Luther Erwin, Jr., 15854A.  
 X Armstrong, Robert Hawkins, 15899A.  
 X Auger, Gerald Francis, 16009A.  
 X Austin, Noel Degner, 15825A.  
 X Badger, William David, Jr., 16004A.  
 X Bahis, Roy Andrew, 15378A.  
 X Baker, William Albert, 15887A.  
 X Bandy, James Ross, Jr., 15874A.  
 X Barnett, Lloyd, Jr., 15873A.  
 X Barrett, Joseph Edward, 15982A.  
 X Bartz, Theodore John, 15851A.  
 X Beam, Walter John, 16044A.  
 X Benshoff, James John, 16029A.  
 X Berry, George Russell, 15806A.  
 X Beukema, Henry Shaw, 15835A.  
 X Bevacqua, Eugene Anthony, 16054A.  
 X Bierman, Clarence Edward, 16045A.  
 X Bingham, Melvin Edgar, 16031A.  
 X Bingham, William Lane, 15914A.  
 X Blake, David, 15922A.  
 X Bolton, Robert Young, 16048A.  
 X Boning, John, 15955A.  
 X Bottomly, Heath, 15893A.  
 X Boutwell, Harold Knight, 15958A.  
 X Bowers, Bernice Overton, 16049A.  
 X Bradley, William Francis, 15959A.  
 X Bright, Robert Paul, 15966A.  
 X Brotherton, Robert Graham, 15909A.  
 X Brouns, Robert Christopher, 15811A.  
 X Brown, George Andrew, 15892A.  
 X Brundin, Robert Henrik, 15844A.  
 X Buchanan, Jack, 15804A.  
 X Buckley, William Robert, Jr., 15930A.  
 X Burke, Robert Emmett, 15983A.  
 X Burrell, Gordon Emmons, 15891A.  
 X Calhoun, John Davis, 15836A.  
 X Callaghan, Eugene Francis, 15950A.  
 X Callan, Robert Brown, 15871A.  
 X Cerasale, Anthony Generos, 16019A.  
 X Chandler, William Sidney, 15956A.  
 X Charlson, William Edward, 15932A.  
 X Cheadle, Geoffrey, 15830A.  
 X Christenson, John Milton, 16021A.  
 X Clayton, Lawrence Locke, Jr., 15952A.  
 X Coble, Clifford Dixon, 15903A.  
 X Coggins, David Robert, 15987A.  
 X Cojeran, Stephen, 15994A.  
 X Cole, Darrell Allan, 16058A.  
 X Connolly, John William, 15816A.  
 X Connor, George Walter, 16023A.  
 X Coons, Richard Laurence, 16039A.  
 X Courtney, William Taylor, 15948A.  
 X Cowee, James Oliver, 15901A.  
 X Creed, Richard Lawrence, Jr., 15939A.  
 X Critchlow, David Madison, 16011A.  
 X Crowell, Dean Garland, 15969A.  
 X Cumberpatch, James Richard, 15876A.  
 X Cupper, Andrew Joseph, 15908A.  
 X Curto, Domenico Antonio, 15803A.  
 X Czapar, Charles Harold, 15863A.  
 X Darr, Wayne Lavern, 15809A.  
 X Deakin, Bruce Keeley, 15913A.  
 X de la Mater, Lyall Davies, Jr., 15942A.  
 X Dennen, Richard Llewellyn, 15837A.  
 X Duke, Daniel Fitzgerald, Jr., 16043A.

X Dunn, Ray Aloysius, Jr., 15915A.  
 X Earley, Leonard Eugene, 15971A.  
 X Edmunds, Alan Clifford, 15875A.  
 X Eglin, Frederick Irving, Jr., 16007A.  
 X Emerson, Harold Robert, 15953A.  
 X Eversole, Delbert Eugene, 16055A.  
 X Faas, Robert William, 15866A.  
 X Fairbrother, William Herman, 15961A.  
 X Farris, Stephen Adam, Jr., 15894A.  
 X Ferris, Donald Joseph, 15980A.  
 X Filson, Robert Lee, 15974A.  
 X Fisher, Harold Carl, 15986A.  
 X Fitton, David Edwards, Jr., 15926A.  
 X Fleischman, George Walter, Jr., 16000A.  
 X Fleming, Dale Robert, 15968A.  
 X Forthoffer, Franklin Oliver, 18310A.  
 X Fournie, James Carmichael, 16003A.  
 X Fowler, Horace George, 15989A.  
 X Fowler, Richard Bernard, 15933A.  
 X Fullilove, William Charles, 15853A.  
 X Gafford, Grady Douglas, 16030A.  
 X Gamble, Louis George, 15850A.  
 X Garrison, James Samuel, 16037A.  
 X Geltz, Theodore Hess, 15886A.  
 X Gerhard, Frederick William, Jr., 15859A.  
 X Gervais, Frederick Banks, 15945A.  
 X Geyer, John Russell, 15858A.  
 X Gillen, Frederick Raymond, 16053A.  
 X Ginsburgh, Robert Neville, 18108A.  
 X Glick, Gregg F., 15869A.  
 X Gray, Bert, 16025A.  
 X Green, James William, 15821A.  
 X Greenhill, Noble Franklin, Jr., 15907A.  
 X Gregor, John Robert, 15805A.  
 X Gregory, Edgar Willis 2d, 15879A.  
 X Griffith, Ray Morris, 16017A.  
 X Grigsby, Howard Burton, 15814A.  
 X Hale, Francis Joseph, 15822A.  
 X Halvorsen, Gail Seymour, 15991A.  
 X Hamm, Paul James, 15938A.  
 X Hammond, William Robert, 15867A.  
 X Hanley, John Warren, 15964A.  
 X Helton, Oscar Underwood, 16012A.  
 X Hemmig, Ralph Brian, 15975A.  
 X Hempleman, Glen Roger, 15852A.  
 X Henderson, Frank David, Jr., 15840A.  
 X Henderson, Landis Duane, 16032A.  
 X Henderson, William Justus, 15842A.  
 X Hendrickson, Leslie H., Jr., 15936A.  
 X Hennessy, Francis Benedict, 15880A.  
 X Hinkley, Leo, 15919A.  
 X Hoffman, George Earl, Jr., 15943A.  
 X Hoidra, George, 15973A.  
 X Holme, Brant, Jr., 15997A.  
 X Horvath, Frederick, 16041A.  
 X Hoxie, Thomas Byron, 15931A.  
 X Humbert, Donald Ardman, 15972A.  
 X Ingalls, Robert Dorrance, Jr., 15965A.  
 X Ingersoll, George Lyman, 15824A.  
 X Janeczak, Raymond, 15883A.  
 X Jentsch, Clarence August Emrich, 16002A.  
 X Johnson, John Nettleton 3d, 15954A.  
 X Johnson, Robert Edwin, 15993A.  
 X Jones, Frank Ross, 16052A.  
 X Jones, James Brady, 15820A.  
 X Jones, Paul, Jr., 15860A.  
 X Kane, Robert Leo, 15812A.  
 X Keever, Bernard Vincent, 15992A.  
 X Kincaid, John Peyton, 15941A.  
 X King, John Creighton, 15925A.  
 X Kizer, Robert Lester, 16050A.  
 X Klosson, Kenneth Alan McLean, 18107A.  
 X Lamp, John Oscar, 15890A.  
 X Lang, Albert Shumway, 16001A.  
 X Linhof, Eric, 16046A.  
 X Livermore, Ross Edward, 16016A.  
 X Long, Emmett Napoleon, 16024A.  
 X Lynn, Thomas James, 15905A.  
 X Mahoney, Thomas Edmund, Jr., 15841A.  
 X March, Christian Laurin, Jr., 16027A.  
 X Maxon, George Emmett, Jr., 15910A.  
 X McCoy, Martin Everett, Jr., 15843A.  
 X McElvey, John Octavius, 15949A.  
 X McGlothlin, William Claude, Jr., 15928A.  
 X McIntire, Jesse Carlton, 16010A.  
 X McIntyre, Angus Joseph, 16035A.  
 X McLean, Arthur Joseph, 15877A.  
 X McNeil, Loyd Jimmie, 15988A.  
 X Merritt, Charles Wilbur, 15996A.  
 X Merritt, Francis Ellis, Jr., 15962A.  
 X Mickelwait, Malcolm Pitzer, 15929A.

X Milnor, William Henry, 15861A.  
 X Mire, Evarice Camile, Jr., 15916A.  
 X Monihan, James Gregory, Jr., 15940A.  
 X Moore, John Peter, 15906A.  
 X Moore, John Tardy, Jr., 15845A.  
 X Moore, Wallace Daniel, 15937A.  
 X Morrison, Robert Eugene, 15857A.  
 X Mortland, Robert Amos, 15868A.  
 X Mouth, James Harry, 15977A.  
 X Muller, Hollis LeRoy, Jr., 15960A.  
 X Mullin, Charles Harris, 15947A.  
 X Murphy, Edward Conley, 15917A.  
 X Murray, Donald Henry, 15999A.  
 X Myslinski, Casimir J., 15934A.  
 X Nassoly, Edward Falvey, 16022A.  
 X Nealon, Ivan Windingland, 15912A.  
 X Nelson, James Richard, 15855A.  
 X Norman, Lewis Sheppard, Jr., 15895A.  
 X Norton, Aloysius Arthur, 15946A.  
 X O'Brien, Kenny D., 15817A.  
 X Owens, Thomas Ralph, 16018A.  
 X Palmer, Duncan, 15921A.  
 X Pardee, Munson Hackett, 15872A.  
 X Peugh, William Earl, 15832A.  
 X Polak, Richard Everard, 15979A.  
 X Porter, Frederick Brenton, Jr., 15896A.  
 X Prah, Val Edward, 15944A.  
 X Pruitt, Victor Claude, 16040A.  
 X Pugh, Lloyd Randolph, Jr., 15902A.  
 X Ragland, Thomas Ben, Jr., 15838A.  
 X Reagan, Robert Paul, 15888A.  
 X Reeves, James, 16033A.  
 X Reeves, Owen Thornton, 15826A.  
 X Rhodes, Ralph Leach, 15881A.  
 X Richards, John Philip, 16057A.  
 X Rivers, Robert Stafford, 15967A.  
 X Roberts, Gail Dexter, 15815A.  
 X Robinson, John Nicholas, Jr., 15864A.  
 X Rogers, Roland, 15810A.  
 X Royem, Robert Louis, Jr., 15897A.  
 X Salzer, Lester LeRoy, 15904A.  
 X Sampson, Charles William, 15839A.  
 X Sanders, John, 15963A.  
 X Scott, Arthur Andrew, 16006A.  
 X Sellers, Robert Carey, Jr., 15828A.  
 X Shoemaker, Robert Milton, 15920A.  
 X Silver, Martin, 16056A.  
 X Simmons, James Norbert, 15819A.  
 X Skinner, Wilfred Fulton, 16013A.  
 X Smith, Foster Lee, 15882A.  
 X Sohn, Bernard, 15827A.  
 X Southwick, William Elvin, 15990A.  
 X Stahl, Edward Schuyler, 15951A.  
 X Steffes, Eugene Quirn, Jr., 15885A.  
 X Steger, William Elbert, 15833A.  
 X Stonebraker, Donald Marvin, 15818A.  
 X Sullivan, William Randolph, 15856A.  
 X Susott, John Leon, 15918A.  
 X Symons, Howard Hamlet, 15884A.  
 X Tanner, Howard Nelson, Jr., 15935A.  
 X Tisdale, Pierre Anthony, 15834A.  
 X Trapold, Augustine Charles 3d, 16005A.  
 X Troupe, John Terney, 16038A.  
 X Truesdell, William Irwin, 16060A.  
 X Trumbo, Waller Franklin, 15978A.  
 X Urban, Robert Sylvester, 16051A.  
 X Walters, William Henry, 15865A.  
 X Warren, Kenneth Eugene, 15985A.  
 X Waterman, Joseph Raymond, 15823A.  
 X Watters, Burr Sells, Jr., 16028A.  
 X Weir, John Gordon, 15911A.  
 X Werner, John Martin, Jr., 15923A.  
 X Whiting, Carlyle Fairfax, 15900A.  
 X Williams, John Gordon, Jr., 15870A.  
 X Williams, Thomas George, 15976A.  
 X Wilson, Louis Andrew, Jr., 15849A.  
 X Winter, Ferdinand John, 16047A.  
 X Wykoff, Gerald Kenneth, 16015A.  
 X Xenakis, Nick James, 16014A.

*To be first lieutenants*

## UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

X Allen, James Rodgers, 17789A.  
 X Anderson, Andrew Broadus, Jr., 17791A.  
 X Anderson, Carl Andrew, 17747A.  
 X Anderson, DeLane Edward, 20693A.  
 X Barber, Kenneth Hawthorne, 17845A.  
 X Barondes, Arthur deRohan, 17774A.  
 X Barton, Raymond Oscar, Jr., 17763A.  
 X Berry, Richard Parks, 17840A.  
 X Bertoni, Waldo Emmerson, 17780A.



× Bettis, Harry Moody, Jr., 17785A.  
 × Braswell, Arnold Webb, 17745A.  
 × Brill, Jay Richard, 17767A.  
 × Buckley, John Joseph, Jr., 17752A.  
 × Buechler, Theodore Bruce, 17833A.  
 × Burrows, William Claude, 17756A.  
 × Butler, Blaine Raymond, Jr., 17803A.  
 × Chanatry, Fred Isaac, 17788A.  
 × Coons, Charles Eads, 17761A.  
 × Cowgill, John Daniel, 17860A.  
 × Creed, John Francis, 17818A.  
 × Crosby, William J., 17823A.  
 × Cudahy, Richard Dickson, 17746A.  
 × D'Allura, Joseph Anthony, 20694A.  
 × Davis, Robert Carroll, 17855A.  
 × De Foe, Daniel, 17797A.  
 × Dent, John Francis, Jr., 17850A.  
 × Dildy, Sims Gerald, 17848A.  
 × Di Loreto, Benjamin Joseph, 17764A.  
 × Dougherty, William Pinkerton, 17831A.  
 × Eakins, Benjamin Wynn, 17766A.  
 × Edwards, George Martin, Jr., 17804A.  
 × Edwards, John Arnold, 17765A.  
 × Elebash, Clarence Couch, 17796A.  
 × Gillogly, Harold Sherwood, 17828A.  
 × Gorrell, Joseph Eugene, 17792A.  
 × Goss, Raymond, Jr., 17859A.  
 × Graves, Warren Reed, 17783A.  
 × Hadley, Russell James, 20695A.  
 × Hayden, William Comstock, 17751A.  
 × Heikkinen, Wilho Richard, 17755A.  
 × Hodge, Phillip E., 17856A.  
 × Huey, Joseph William, 17844A.  
 × Hurt, Samuel Fuqua, 17821A.  
 × Johnston, Floyd Allan, 17822A.  
 × Josephs, Jay Silverman, 17793A.  
 × Kastris, John, Jr., 17837A.  
 × Kavanagh, Donal Denis, 17809A.  
 × Kerth, Alfred Henry, Jr., 17768A.  
 × Kipfer, Donald Charles, 17819A.  
 × Kritzler, Edward Anderton, 17825A.  
 × La Pointe, George Adelbert, 17771A.  
 × Leitner, George Newton, 17824A.  
 × Lewando, Vincent Paul, 17808A.  
 × Locke, W. Grim, 17800A.  
 × LoConte, Louis, Jr., 17754A.  
 × Long, Denman Murray, 17759A.  
 × Lynch, William Henry, 17772A.  
 × Lyon, William Meredith, 17805A.  
 × Lyons, Richard Edward, 18306A.  
 × MacCartney, Gaylord, 17810A.  
 × Madden, William James, 17839A.  
 × Mandros, William James, 20692A.  
 × Mansour, Nasor John, Jr., 17811A.  
 × Mathis, Robert Couth, 17787A.  
 × McGinness, William Thornton, 17760A.  
 × McInerney, Francis William, Jr., 17834A.  
 × McManaway, James Clifford, Jr., 17799A.  
 × Miner, Richard Lee, 17777A.  
 × Moore, Otis Corcoran, 17756A.  
 × Morgan, Rhonel Earl, 17814A.  
 × Mounger, William Donald, 17812A.  
 × Muehlenweg, James Allen, 17778A.  
 × Mumma, Morton Claire, 3d, 17773A.  
 × Newton, John R., Jr., 17858A.  
 × O'Connell, William Thomas, Jr., 17835A.  
 × Pater, Robert Edwin, 17838A.  
 × Peppers, Jack Francis, 17846A.  
 × Phillips, Thomas Albert, Jr., 17776A.  
 × Pickering, John Charles, 17750A.  
 × Pomeroy, Robert Murray, 17795A.  
 × Pompan, Jacob Bernard, 17832A.  
 × Porter, Philip Steven, 17854A.  
 × Quanbeck, Alton Harold, 17790A.  
 × Rosencrans, Evan William, 17807A.  
 × Rusk, Richard Norman, 17857A.  
 × Rutter, George Warren, 17770A.  
 × Sandman, James Gage, 17762A.  
 × Saville, Rodman, 17794A.  
 × Schalk, Louis Wellington, 17786A.  
 × Schoenberg, Irving Bernard, 17820A.  
 × Scott, Edward Leigh, 17801A.  
 × Seguin, Richard James, 17753A.  
 × Selig, Ivan Morange, 17802A.  
 × Seymoe, Joseph Phillip, 19581A.  
 × Shively, James Cole, Jr., 17849A.  
 × Skinner, Richard Ingram, 17830A.  
 × Skouras, Charles Peter, Jr., 17847A.  
 × Smith, William Young, 17775A.

× Snyder, Arthur, Jr., 17843A.  
 × Stein, Richard Neil, 17784A.  
 × Stelling, Henry Barthold, Jr., 17779A.  
 × Swenholt, Donald Brunhoff, 17817A.  
 × Tashjian, Michael Joseph, 17842A.  
 × Thevenet, Stanley Edward, 17836A.  
 × Thomas, George Selby, 17813A.  
 × Van Arsdall, Robert Armes, 17829A.  
 × Van Fleet, James Alward, Jr., 17852A.  
 × Waller, Walton Vernon, 17841A.  
 × Weaver, Paul Elwood, 17769A.  
 × White, Samuel, Jr., 17781A.  
 × Williams, Francis Marion, 17798A.  
 × Williamson, Odell Wynne, Jr., 17853A.  
 × Withers, John Kesson, 17816A.  
 × Wurster, Charles Anderson, 17748A.  
 × Young, Stewart, 17757A.

#### MEDICAL SERVICE

× Dye, William Eugene, 19972A.

NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to major, captain, and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of June 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26 (legislative day of April 17), 1951:

##### POSTMASTERS

###### MINNESOTA

Herbert H. Schur, Mountain Iron.  
Josephine M. Wozniak, Ogema.

###### NORTH CAROLINA

Susie I. Ledbetter, Mount Gilead.  
Charles Braxton Craven, Ramseur.  
Berdis R. Stone, St. Pauls.

###### PENNSYLVANIA

Michael C. Barone, Bryn Mawr.  
Patrick N. Lindner, Enon Valley.  
Guy Edward D'Eletto, Pulaski.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that during this day we may sense the privilege and responsibility of meeting the challenge of each new opportunity for service to Thee and our fellow men.

We are bringing unto Thee our many needs, beseeching Thee that our souls may be cleansed and purified and that all our motives and purposes may be ennobled and redirected to loftier ends.

Lift us by Thy grace to higher levels of faith in Thy guiding and sustaining presence and may we covet more sincerely the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the God fearing and the faithful.

Kindle within us the light that shone in the minds and hearts of saints and sages, of heroes and patriots who walked the highways of righteousness and served their generation courageously and loyally.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 12, 1951:

H. R. 2615. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

On April 16, 1951:

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the printing of the annual reports of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America as separate House documents.

On April 17, 1951:

H. R. 599. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Delaware to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Alvin Smith, of New Castle, Del., arising out of the damage sustained by him as a result of the construction and maintenance of the New Castle United States Army Air Base, New Castle, Del., and

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Capt. Marciano O. Garces.

On April 18, 1951:

H. R. 3040. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Ogden, Utah, to the Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

On April 20, 1951:

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein.

On April 23, 1951:

H. R. 1249. An act for the relief of LaFayette Brewery, Inc.

On April 25, 1951:

H. R. 1. An act to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution making an emergency appropriation for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3336. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 998. An act to facilitate the financing of the defense contracts by banks and other financing institutions, to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 27, in which to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

# CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

## [Roll No. 36]

Addonizio	Fisher	Murphy
Anfuso	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Baring	Gore	Powell
Battle	Gwinn	Prouty
Bonner	Harden	Rains
Bramblett	Hart	Redden
Breen	Heffernan	Riehlman
Brehm	Heller	Rivers
Brownson	Herter	Rodino
Buchanan	Hinsaw	Sabath
Buckley	Hollfield	Sadiak
Burleson	Irving	St. George
Busby	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Scrivner
Cannon	Jonas	Sheehan
Chatham	Kee	Shelley
Chelf	Kennedy	Sieminski
Couderc	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Dawson	Kilburn	Stockman
D'Ewart	Klein	Towe
Dingell	Lantaff	Whitaker
Dollinger	Lucas	Winstead
Dondero	McKinnon	Wolcott
Doyle	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Morrison	Woodruff
Elston	Moulder	Yates
Fine	Multer	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 353 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

## FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue for a short while, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3842, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth supplemental appropriation bill. It contains items that were considered before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and before the Subcommittee on Armed Forces.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], chair-

man of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use 10 minutes, but my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] no doubt will want to consume some time.

The independent offices appropriation bill has an item in this deficiency for the Atomic Energy Commission. We had a budget estimate of \$51,300,000. This is all construction money, and it covers the construction of some 10 or 12 projects, but the big main project is at Hanford, Wash., which has a budget estimate in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000. May I respectfully call the attention of the membership to page 2 of the report where the committee attempts to set out in some 15 or 20 short lines our recommendations and our feelings in the matter? We cut this estimate about \$4,500,000, not with the idea of hamstringing, or delaying, or crippling in any manner or form the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, but we do think that after a more careful screening, planning, and revision of the projects involved here that some ten, fifteen, or even more millions of savings can be made in construction even though we realize that construction costs are apparently on the incline rather than the decline. But a saving can be made in our opinion, as I said a minute ago, by careful screening and cutting out some of the frills and fads and some of the unnecessary details; and that can be done without curtailing the utility of any of the buildings involved in here.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House in considering this bill will bear in mind that this is a unanimous report of the entire Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is correct that this is a unanimous report from the subcommittee of which he is chairman and of which I am a member. I think it would not be improper to say that to a certain extent we must put into this bill a figure which we reach somewhat blindly, knowing that this amount of money and more will be spent by the Atomic Energy Commission before the present war ends. With the regular commitments which will come before the House in the independent offices bill, on which we begin general debate Monday, the Commission will show a marked increase, not only of money but an increase in the commitments for employees. It seems to me that it would not be out of order, Mr. Chairman, to suggest to you and to the Atomic Energy Commission that the utmost economy, the utmost care and good management now if ever should be exercised by this agency. The pressure of demands for war upon the taxpayers of this country will be so great that they could produce a burden that could change the economy of this country; consequently, we are not too happy, Mr. Chairman,

when we find that in those things the cost of which we do know, the operation of a city, the management of a city, the operation of a bus line, the operation of a cafeteria, the building of a road—that in these things where we are able to go into the expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission and compare them with known costs to other public agencies or with a city or a private business, we find I think invariably, Mr. Chairman, that the cost to the Atomic Energy Commission is greater than it has been to the public or private agency. I say hopefully that I believe much of that is being changed, but I do not think completely changed. It has been only a few days since the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] sent our committee figures on the building of a junior high school in the city of Richland, which is the Atomic Energy installation in that area, for which an estimate had been provided of some \$1,700,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think you will admit that there are not many junior high schools in the United States which cost \$1,700,000; but the actual finished cost of that school to the taxpayers of the United States was \$3,800,000. This is an example of what I mean. It is a reasonably recent example, the building having been constructed about a year and a half ago. It is an example of what I mean, that while we have generally a willingness in this Congress to vote the Atomic Energy Commission all the moneys they need with a liberality which is to the credit of the Congress, we have reached a place where it is not only desirable but necessary that we should check the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission, not only those which we can compare with the expenditures in business or in other agencies of Government, but we must from now on go more carefully into the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission which deal with the production of atomic power and the making of weapons.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is there any money in the appropriation for the building of any school for an atomic-energy project?

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is not in this particular appropriation. Perhaps I did not understand the question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I wanted to know if there is any money being appropriated in this particular bill for the construction of any schools for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer is "No," but the gentleman will also understand there was nothing in the previous appropriation for the building of a school at Richland, Wash.; nevertheless a school was built on the grounds, it was a necessary expenditure to provide education for the children, with which both the gentleman and I would agree.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only reason I ask the question is that all of those projects are supposed to be in the Depart-



ment of Education, which comes under the appropriation bill covering the Federal Security Agency. We did have some money in there for the construction of schools in North Carolina. That is the only reason I asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I was using that only as an illustration to show that wherever we find the Atomic Energy Commission building something, building a road in California, running a bus line in Tennessee, managing a city in Tennessee, building a school in the State of Washington, and compare the costs of those with the costs of the same operations in private industry or by a county or by a school district or by a State we find the AEC costs to be higher. The gentleman will also recall I said that certain changes have taken place internally in the Commission itself and in the management of the Atomic Energy Commission, and I am hopeful we can look forward to a newer and better day.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman finds as I do when he visits military installations that they use a lot of special-made office furnishings, not only on the inside of the buildings, such as desks, chairs, and cabinets, but also special millwork, special doors, special windows, and special trimmings that cost as much as five times more than standard stock, but is not 1 cent better, in fact, too often its flimsy stuff, dreamed up by a brain-storm designer and architect to raise the cost in order to raise their commission.

Last December I visited a military installation in the State of New Mexico. The minute I drove up to that installation I saw all the outside doors were of special design with three glasses, one glass 12 inches from the bottom of the door, another one up toward the middle, and another one at the top. Those doors cost much more than stock or standard doors, and the stock standard doors would be better and last longer. I hope the committee will see to it that they stop putting a lot of frills and frosting in buildings paid for with tax dollars. Millions upon millions can be saved by using standard materials.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is the gentleman implying that he would expect a Government employee to use the same quality door that a taxpayer would use?

Mr. JENSEN. Maybe that would be too much to expect of the spenders and wasters in power. I visited a number of Government installations of every nature and in every instance they have used a lot of specially made materials and equipment that cost several times more than good, fine, standard stock.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is right. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, upon my request a couple of rather large charts have been prepared which present in rather graphic form certain basic information in regard to military appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. Those charts are now before you and I think they can be seen by all Members who are present. I should like to make reference in the beginning and without interruption, if I may, to the information provided in these charts. Let me say that they will be placed in the RECORD and will be, of course, available to the Members.

#### Department of Defense, fiscal year 1951

##### APPROPRIATIONS (In billions of dollars)

Department	Regular bill	First and second supplemental	Fourth supplemental	Total
Army.....	4.1	12.4	2.9	19.4
Navy.....	4.1	6.7	1.6	12.4
Air Force.....	4.8	9.2	1.9	15.9
Office, Secretary of Defense.....	.3	.2	0	.5
Total.....	13.3	28.5	6.4	48.2

##### MILITARY STRENGTH—END OF YEAR (In thousands)

	Regular bill	First and second supplemental	Fourth supplemental	Total
Army.....	630	633	287	1,550
Navy (including Marine Corps).....	452	403	84	939
Air Force.....	416	235	199	850
Total.....	1,498	1,271	570	3,339

<sup>1</sup> No funds carried in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for the Department of Defense.

##### ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (Billions of dollars)

	Regular bill	First and second supplemental	Fourth supplemental	Total	Amount	Percent
Military personnel: Pay, subsistence, clothing, etc.....	4.3	3.0	0.8	8.1	17	
Operation and maintenance of forces, plant and equipment.....	3.6	6.4	1.5	11.5	24	
Procurement of tanks, planes, ships, and other major equipment.....	3.1	15.8	3.8	22.7	47	
Public works.....	.3	1.8	.3	2.4	5	
Research and development.....	.6	.6	0	1.2	2	
Civilian components, industrial mobilization, etc.....	1.4	.9	0	2.3	5	
Total.....	13.3	28.5	6.4	48.2	100	

<sup>1</sup> No funds carried in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, for the Department of Defense.

I would like first to direct your attention to the large chart on my right. First, let me say that we passed the regular appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1951, the fiscal year ending June 30 of this year, and in that bill you will note we provided roughly \$13,000,000,000. That was before Korea, and that bill was approved by the Congress upon the recommendation, generally speaking and without reference to specific details, of men like General Bradley, General Eisenhower, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom, however, said that more money was desirable. But in view of the economic condition of the country

and the desire not to increase taxes, the clamor for economy and other considerations the Congress approved this amount. The amount was substantially that which had been requested by the President in his budget message to Congress.

Then Korea came, and we provided the Army, as you will note, in the second column, with twelve and four-tenths billion additional, the Navy with six and seven-tenths billion and the Air Force with nine and two-tenths billion and the Office of the Secretary with two-tenths billion, making a total after Korea of twenty-eight and five-tenths billion additional for defense. I should point out that I am referring to the first supplemental bill of last August and the second supplemental of December 15, 1950. You will note from the charts that when the word "billion" is used billion or billions of dollars is meant.

Now in the pending supplemental bill you will observe that the Army is getting two and nine-tenths billion, the Navy one and six-tenths billion, and the Air Force one and nine-tenths billion, making a total of six and four-tenths billion, and making a total appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force of forty-eight and two-tenths billion. That sum, of course, does not include in excess of \$12,000,000,000 which has been provided for national defense through the Atomic Energy Commission and programs of economic and military assistance to Western Europe and elsewhere through the Marshall plan, and so forth. So, when we include the twelve billion that gives an over-all picture of appropriations, taking into consideration the pending bill which is before us now, of \$60,000,000,000 for defense in one form or another appropriated in fiscal 1951. It is anticipated that this pending legislation will be the end of major requests for funds for the military for the fiscal year 1951.

It might well be asked, "What will be done with the \$48,000,000,000 provided the Department of Defense?" The military had on hand when the present fiscal year began about \$8,000,000,000 which was available for expenditure for the procurement of items, planes principally, so the Department of Defense actually will have, considering the bill today and the carry-over from last year about \$56,000,000,000 for expenditure for military purposes during the fiscal year 1951.

Members of the House know that you cannot buy national defense with dollars only. It takes time. Particularly does it take time for certain highly technical items such as electronics items and the construction of airplanes and many of the gadgets that are essential to modern warfare. So the military will have available to them for expenditures this year \$56,000,000,000, but they will actually spend only \$19,000,000,000. They anticipate in fiscal 1952 that they will spend about forty-one-plus billion dollars.

It was not necessary that we appropriate all this money. We could have provided contract authorizations for

some of it and made the actual appropriation much less at this time. However, it has been found to be more desirable from various viewpoints to provide the money. There is no loss to the Government and there is no hazard involved in the making of the appropriations. The funds are available for commitment when these various items are contracted for by the Department of Defense.

I think when you consider what we are doing in fiscal year 1951 moneywise you must also consider what we probably will do in fiscal 1952. In other words, it does not make sense to climb up the hill in fiscal year 1951 and rush down the hill in fiscal year 1952. So this program for fiscal 1951 is coordinated with the estimated program for the coming fiscal year—the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951.

We expect to begin our hearings in about 10 days on the fiscal 1952 military appropriation bill. I have no official figures, but it is my belief that the budget request which will be made of the Congress by the President later this week or early next week will be approximately \$60,000,000,000. This is the sum that was contained in the President's budget in January of this year. It is a smaller sum than many of us some time ago had anticipated would be requested, but, in my judgment, the budget request will probably be within the range of the \$60,000,000,000 budget proposal of last January.

Let us look further at the chart on my right. We show there the military strength as of the end of the year. It is in thousands. In the regular bill we provided for 630,000 men in the Army. In the supplemental bills to date we have provided for 633,000 men. Then we provide for 287,000 in this bill. This gives the Army an end-year strength as of July 1, 1951, of 1,550,000 men—officers and enlisted men.

In the Navy, you will note the chart indicates that in the first regular bill we had 452,000. We added 403,000. We now add 84,000. So the Navy will have 939,000 as of June 30, 1951. This includes the Marines. Of the 939,000, something over 200,000 will be Marines. That will be the Navy strength. The Air Force strength began with the original bill at 416,000. It was increased by 235,000 and here we add 199,000. The end-of-year strength will be about 850,000. The total officers and enlisted men in our Military Establishment at the end of June of this year will be approximately 3,300,000.

When we look at those figures we must recognize there are not enough men provided for the waging of an all-out major war. We might as well say what is obvious to all thinking people, friends and foes alike, that the United States is not now prepared to wage an all-out war against a major power. We are vastly stronger than we were before Korea and with every passing month we are becoming stronger, but we are still far away from the goal of a fully adequate preparedness program. It takes time to train men and provide the highly technical weapons of modern warfare.

I think it can be said that no nation on earth is now fully prepared to fight an all-out war against a major power. Unfortunately, this is not a guaranty against the outbreak of global war. We can only hope that our efforts toward peace will bring success. We want the world to know that the object of our preparedness program is peace and not war. Of course, if a full scale war comes, and we fervently pray that it will not, we must be as well prepared as possible to meet that tragic occurrence. With the broad mobilization base which we are seeking to establish, we hope that we would be able to prevent disaster in the early stages of such a war and proceed to build up our strength and achieve ultimate victory.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. In reference to the figure of half a billion dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense, although there is nothing surprising to me in the large figure for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the item of a half billion dollars for the Office of Secretary of Defense is surprising, and I think it would be useful if the Committee had more information about that figure.

Mr. MAHON. I can well understand the gentleman's viewpoint. Actually, that half a billion dollars for the Department of Defense is for funds expended for the Department or through the Department. One of the most important items is for retired pay, which is provided for by law, and that runs to a very considerable sum.

Mr. TABER. It amounts to \$300,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, it amounts to in excess of \$300,000,000.

Another item included there is something in the range of \$100,000,000 or more in the form of an emergency fund which is principally for research and development. In one of the supplemental bills, rather than give research and development funds to the different branches of the service we made it available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with the understanding that through the Board of Research and Development and through the various Secretaries, the funds could be channeled in the right direction. So that figure becomes more realistic when you understand that picture.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Why should not the item of retirement pay for the Army be charged to the Army and the retirement pay for the Navy be charged to the Navy, and so forth?

Mr. MAHON. That is the way it formerly was. It was thought that we should have reorganization and consolidation of functions insofar as possible and that we might probably have more economy in the administration of the defense program. For that purpose, to achieve economy, the work was centralized and is now handled through the

Office of the Secretary of Defense, which seems not illogical.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman said that no other major power was prepared for war with any other major power.

Mr. MAHON. I believe I said that no nation on earth, minor or major, is now prepared for an all-out shooting war against a major power. I think the gentleman will agree with that statement, and we must be realistic about it.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman includes the U. S. S. R. in that?

Mr. MAHON. I certainly would think so. I do not think the gentleman from Ohio believes that the U. S. S. R. is totally and completely prepared for an all-out successful war against a major power, such as our own. And the best proof of that is that such war is not in progress at this time.

Mr. VORYS. I did not know—I am glad to have the gentleman's information.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's logic—his conclusions on that matter—would be as good as my own or better. I think those who would destroy freedom and democracy in America would undertake it if they thought they were strong enough to do it. I believe the course we are now taking to provide a greater degree of preparedness, in the fullest sense of the word, is the best hope for peace and, if war comes, the best hope for victory.

Now, let us turn to this chart on your left, if we may. This is a very revealing chart, and it will be placed in the RECORD. It shows what is being done in broad outline with the money which we are providing. Of course, we must pay soldiers, sailors, and airmen officers and enlisted men, and feed and clothe them. This chart shows that this year we are providing appropriations to the extent of \$8,000,000,000, or 17 percent of the total, for that purpose. Then for operations and maintenance of the force—you have to have gasoline and all of those things necessary for the operation of airfields, Navy installations and Army installations—for that purpose we are providing eleven and five-tenths billion for this year, making a total of 24 percent of the total appropriated for the Department of Defense. There was one time when we had much to say about how fast we should produce hardware, meaning airplanes, guns, and weapons. We have spent two or three billion dollars on research and development since World War II hostilities ended, and through the expenditure of those funds we have outmoded practically all the weapons of war which we had in use or storage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

But with conditions as they are now, of course, it is most urgent that we have on hand not necessarily perfect weapons, but the most practical weapons that we can produce to meet the threat which is before us.



So, of the \$48,200,000,000 provided this year, 47 percent, or \$22,700,000,000, will go for procurement of tanks, planes, ships, and other major equipment.

Let me point out at this moment that we are not getting what we thought we were getting when we passed the previous appropriation bills, by reason of inflation. In this bill before us we have placed \$758,000,000 to cover price increases for items previously provided for or for procurement yet to come. The Army part of that is over \$678,000,000. The Navy part is over \$80,000,000. There are no funds to take up the slack for the Air Force. The Air Force is buying less with the money they have, rather than requesting additional funds to make up what they are losing by reason of inflationary trends. A few significant things might be pointed out with reference to price increases. There are \$90,000,000 in this bill because of the increase in the price of tanks.

Blankets have recently gone from \$7.82 to \$16.

Combat boots have gone from \$6.03 to \$11.63.

That is an indication of where some of the money is going, but of course this is not a price-stabilization measure before us now.

Again looking at the chart at our left I read the following:

Public works, 5 percent of the total.

Research and development, \$1,200,000, or 2 percent.

There are no funds in the supplemental bill for civilian components, but 5 percent of the total expenditure for the year will be for that purpose.

These charts will be placed in the Record and will give an over-all explanation of what we are seeking to do.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. With respect to the gentleman's reference to the increased cost due to inflation, which indicated three-quarters of a billion out of a total of \$6,400,000,000, representing the increased cost—

Mr. MAHON. The money is for increased costs in the current bill and for previous bills to make up for inadequate funds previously provided for certain items.

Mr. COLE of New York. That does not give us the full picture unless we can know what previous period was used as a base.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Could the gentleman tell us what that period was?

Mr. MAHON. The over-all increase has cost us several billions of dollars.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not mean that.

Mr. MAHON. The increase in price has cost us several billion dollars. Some items have gone up 100 percent, some 5 percent.

Mr. COLE of New York. Have gone up over when?

Mr. MAHON. Over pre-Korea.

Mr. COLE of New York. So we can understand that the cost of raw mate-

rials is about 10 percent over what it was a year ago.

Mr. MAHON. I would say it would be nearer 15 percent over that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Over what it was a year ago?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and when you apply that to certain electronic equipment, to blankets, boots, and some other items, it is greater.

Now, as to the supplemental bill before us, all of us want to save money, because we recognize the necessity for maintaining the economic stability of this Government. The President in his budget message of last January estimated there would be a supplemental military request to Congress this year for \$10,000,000,000. A few weeks ago, representatives of the three services came before our committee for a preliminary discussion as to requirements. Defense officials made no specific requests at that time, but they indicated that a supplemental bill within the range of nine billion six hundred million might possibly be required. However, there was much uncertainty on that point.

We told these representatives of the services that we would like to defer any expenditure that could safely be deferred if such deferment would not militate against the military build-up and the security of the country; and we said, "If you will carefully survey your needs and make reductions which can be made without injury to the national defense program we will undertake to give you the briefest hearings possible and pass the bill as soon as reasonably possible."

Some of these funds are needed now, and a considerable portion of the funds will be required by the 1st of May; so in keeping with the request of the committee the Department of Defense reconsidered the whole problem and came to us with \$6,400,000,000, and we have more or less accepted it in toto after hearing the pros and cons of requirements over a period of days.

In the field, in the committee, and elsewhere, we have sought to do what we could toward getting more for our money and toward delaying expenditure such as for the building of new barracks as substitutes for existing temporary structures when these existing barracks would last 3 or 4 more years, although they might not be all that we would desire.

There is no doubt that if all-out global war should strike within the next few weeks or within the next few months our hindsight would reveal that we should have provided more money now in order that we could move more rapidly with our defense effort. In other words, we will not be making tanks as fast as we can make them; we will not be making other weapons as fast as it is possible for us to make them. That is, in some instances.

The philosophy of the Department of Defense and of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, as I understand it, is that we provide the broadest possible base for industrial mobilization but that we not provide all

the hardware and put it on the shelf and await the time that we may need it.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. WIER. The gentleman's observation a minute ago was that the original request of the agencies was for \$9,600,000,000. After a request was made of them to cut to the bone they came back with \$6,000,000,000. The gentleman mentioned that some of the things involved were delay in the construction of barracks. Would the gentleman itemize a few of the other places in which they made these savings of almost \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. MAHON. May I say that it would be in error to make the statement there was a saving of almost \$4,000,000,000. I must further make plain that there was no budget estimate. There was no official request of the Congress or the committee that we provide nine billion six hundred million. That was a tentative figure which was first arrived at and after we had gone through these figures with defense officials it was the defense officials themselves who arrived at the figure carried in the current bill. Some items were held over for inclusion in the regular defense appropriation which should be passed by Congress a little later. There were some actual savings but not to the extent of \$3,000,000,000. We have sought to expedite our preparedness program in every practical way.

Now as to barracks, we have not sought to retard the program of building barracks. We have endeavored to expedite that. But there are many installations of World War II construction that are in bad repair, and we told officials to patch them up with a few dollars, relatively speaking, rather than to spend millions of dollars building new barracks at this time; we wanted to move along with the program and at the same time do no injury to the defense program and save a lot of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am a little confused but I feel sure there is an explanation. The figures as to military strength indicate that this fourth supplemental will make provision for a total added military strength of 570,000 men. The first and second supplemental made provision for added military strength of 1,271,000. The amount in this bill is six billion four, whereas the amount in the first and second supplemental was twenty-eight billion five. Included in the figures here, as the gentleman has explained, there is three-fourths of a billion involved in price increases. The comparisons I have made make it apparent that either one of the figures is wrong. How is it this bill with less than one-fourth of the funds involved in the other bills makes provision for nearly half as many as the first and second

supplemental bills? Does the gentleman get my point?

Mr. MAHON. I get the point and the answer is easy. The general disposition of some of our people when they are confused is not to be so tolerant as the gentleman from New York but to conclude that everybody in the Military Establishment or in the country or in the Government is crazy. Here is the explanation and the answer to the gentleman's question: When we had up the Second Supplemental last December it was stated that the supplemental bill then before us did not take into consideration the fact that the Red Chinese had come into the Korean conflict; so we have had additional men brought into the service since that time for which funds had not previously been provided. That is a partial answer to the gentleman's question. The more pertinent answer is that these funds are for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1951, which will end on July 1, 1951. The funds provided will not pay the men for an entire year but for only a fraction of a year. Some of them may not be on the payrolls for more than 1 day. It all depends on how long you pay them, and this is for the supplemental which will be for May and June, a couple of months. That, I believe is the explanation to the gentleman's question, which, I am sure, he would have grasped readily had he had an opportunity to have a look at the figures involved.

Mr. KEATING. So that the 570,000 includes those who may be taken in tomorrow and those who may be taken in on June 30.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. And contemplates the additional figure as of the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his excellent clarification of the situation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman say a few minutes ago that we provide the appropriation and establish the fund? I think he said something to that effect; that is, in advance of expenditures.

Mr. MAHON. If we want to order a billion dollars' worth of airplanes, and those airplanes will not be delivered for 3 years and will not have to be paid for for 3 years, we nevertheless have followed the practice and are following the practice of providing the money. Now, you must provide the money or contract authorization in order to make firm contracts with industry. The money is not removed from the Treasury. There is no additional cost. Many thousands of dollars are saved in bookkeeping. It is a more realistic approach than providing the contract authorization one year and then coming back and providing more contract authorizations and cash, and you get yourself lost in a maze of figures

and you confuse the American people so that nobody knows how much we are spending because of the confusion between contract authorizations and appropriations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to clear up. I think the gentleman is in error, if I understand him correctly, when he says we provide the money. Now, we have not yet provided the dollars specified in the appropriation. The Treasury does not provide those vast sums in advance.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is a banker, and I think his explanation is exactly correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The appropriation is made with reference to the authorization, with which I agree.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But you do not provide the dollars in advance?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because to do so would pile up billions and billions of dollars into the Treasury on which the Treasury pays interest and on which nobody gets any benefit. We provide these funds as they are required to be expended. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is completely correct, as I understand it, and I appreciate his making the issue crystal clear for the record.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want the gentleman from Michigan to listen to this, because I do not fully agree with the point made by the gentleman from Texas. We used to appropriate contract authorizations and then we carried them as contract authorizations and supplemented them in succeeding years with money. We had to show it on the tabulations as contract authorizations. Now we appropriate money. Each year we have to show it as money appropriated but not spent. I see no difference. It is just as confusing one way or the other, and it seems to me it is more confusing to have appropriated the money and have it sitting over there where we have to keep constantly deducting it from the amount of money spent in 1 year, and appropriate the amount of money we spend in a fiscal year here less than the amount of money still in the Treasury waiting to be spent on some contract.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman states a point of view. He might be right, but I prefer the method we are now following.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so far as confusion is concerned on both sides of the case, I think it exists. But personally I would prefer to have the appropriation made, let the people in this country know it has been made, let them see the tax burden ahead of them, or the deficit, on which they have to buy bonds, so that they will know.

Mr. MAHON. If they want to read further, they will find that Congress has

provided this current fiscal year about \$80,000,000,000 to \$84,000,000,000 in appropriations, but if they will read the fine print they will find that we will spend about \$44,000,000,000 during the current fiscal year and that there will be an estimated surplus in the Treasury of \$2,000,000,000; that we expect to spend in 1952 about \$71,000,000,000 but that we will appropriate for that year probably a sum nearer the range of \$90,000,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is that confusing.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. I have read the report on the appropriation bill thoroughly, and I commend the gentleman for the thorough manner in which he presented the procurement section of the Army.

One thing I should like to know something about along with the gentleman's discussion of using the old cantonments, and so forth, is that during World War II we spent multiple billions of dollars in building various supplemental airfields around the country. Those concrete runways and other facilities provided then are still pretty much intact; yet I see in the papers that new airfields are being established at considerable cost. I wonder to what extent the gentleman has prevailed on the Air Force to use such facilities as might be available to them without building new ones?

Mr. MAHON. That has been one of the things we have strenuously insisted upon, that old installations which are adaptable and can be used should be used rather than going out and starting from the beginning with new installations, our object being economy in the expenditure of Federal funds. The Air Force had several hundred installations of one kind or another which are not now in use and which will not come into use unless there is an all-out major shooting war.

Generally speaking, the bases where construction is being provided are bases that were formerly in use, and these bases are being reactivated. But for an example to the contrary, take Wichita, Kans., which was a very controversial matter before our committee, where we are spending over \$40,000,000. There was no base there, but we had spent several million dollars, about \$20,000,000, as I recall, in defense plant buildings for the B-29 plant during World War II, which is now making our jet bomber, the B-47. The B-47 is like all other new aircraft of a highly complicated nature, it has a lot of bugs in it. It is not perfect. The Air Force wanted to have an air base adjacent to the plant so when a B-47 took off and it did not run properly, when it landed on the strip the pilot could just taxi it over to the factory and say, "This gadget won't work just as we think it ought to work, and we want to improve it. We want you to fix it up so we can fly it tomorrow." The decision as to the field at Wichita was in our judgment a wise one. The B-36 was a very imperfect airplane when it was first



produced, but by reason of the fact that Carswell Field, at Fort Worth, Tex., is adjacent to the B-36 plant in Fort Worth, technicians have taken the bugs out of the B-36—remedied its imperfections—much more rapidly and probably have saved 2 or 3 years in perfecting our intercontinental bomber. I think we will perhaps save 2 or 3 years in perfecting the B-47 by the same plan. That is the most outstanding instance of providing for a new military installation.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman. He has made a good explanation. So many people in west Texas, where some of the inactivated fields were established, cannot understand why those fields are not being reactivated when new installations are being constructed. I think the gentleman's explanation is very sound. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I do not recall at the moment any other new fields. But I certainly agree with my friend that we should practice economy and utilize what we have in a practical manner.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is making an excellent statement and is well informed on his subject. The gentleman referred a few moments ago to the fact that we are not building tanks and planes as fast as we could.

Mr. MAHON. We are building planes, I would say, just about as fast as we could and we are preparing to build tanks in a very big way.

Mr. EVINS. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us what percent of these figures represent an increase over the appropriation for the military prior to Korea; in other words, that would reflect just how much we are speeding up the production. We know how much the increase is, but we do not know the percentage.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will refer to the chart, it shows \$13,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year prior to Korea, and now it has gone all the way up to \$48,000,000,000, which indicates a build-up not only in military strength but in procurement, procurement being 47 percent of the total. The idea in building tanks is that it is better to have a plant working 8 hours a day 5 days a week and have four or five such plants that could go into a two-shift or a three-shift operation immediately upon the beginning of hostilities, than it is to have just one plant making tanks and running three shifts and pushing hard, because in the event of a war you would be stuck for additional mobilization facilities.

In this bill we have provided the sum of \$1,324,000,000 for expanding plant facilities. Not that we are building new plants, but we are expanding plant facilities. We built so many of them in World War II that we have not had to go out and build them from scratch, so to speak.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman could give us a breakdown or a more complete explanation than is in the report of that item of \$400,000,000 for expedition of production.

Mr. MAHON. As I was just saying to the gentleman, actually the amount in the entire bill is \$1,324,000,000 for all purposes for all three services. The gentleman has referred to one part of the program. There is considerable information in the hearings on this program, I will say to my friend. This largely is for machine tools. Here is a manufacturer, like General Motors or Chrysler, who is called upon to build some highly technical military gadget for which there is no commercial market. The Government buys the machine tools and the individual or company, if it is a private plant, naturally furnishes the housing and the plant. The tools belong to the Government. They may be used only to a very small extent, unless an all-out war comes. But they are there to be used. That, generally speaking, is the over-all philosophy of this type of program, which I think is sound.

Mr. Chairman, I have used more time than I should have, but in view of the questions which have been raised, considerable time was required. Even so, many important items in the bill have not been discussed at all. We are dealing in astronomical sums, but the fate of the Nation is involved. We must proceed as rapidly as we can toward increasing our military strength. I, for one, am not willing to guess that we will not have an all-out shooting war with a major power this year. I do not know what the future holds and I doubt that anybody knows. It may be that those who sit in the Kremlin have not made up their timetables. But I do know there is no time for us to lose in our preparations and the building up of our strength. I hope it will develop that all of these weapons which we produce and are getting in position to produce will not be required and that we may achieve our real objective, which is peace.

This is no time to be sidetracked with acrimonious arguments and personalities and side issues. From a bipartisan standpoint it seems to me we need to go forward together with this defense program. I present it to you with complete confidence that all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are anxious to build up the strength of this Nation and will fully support this measure and actually would like to provide more funds for a greater build-up if such were feasible under the facts and circumstances. The greater build-up will be provided for the new fiscal year which begins on July 1. We expect to begin hearings on the new bill in 10 days and present it to Congress for passage as soon as reasonably possible.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the original budget estimate for deficiencies and supplemental items for the Military Establishment called for \$10,000,000,000.

After it became apparent that the Congress was aroused and did not intend

to be wasteful in its approach to the spending of money, and after the Budget Bureau and Mr. Lovett, Under Secretary of Defense—I think that is his title, but at any rate he is the individual who is the burden bearer in the Department of Defense—after he and his aides had gone over the situation carefully and the budget had gone over it, estimates were submitted to us for the military totaling \$6,421,681,000.

Frankly, I believe that those items will adequately take care of the needs of the armed services up to the 1st of July. There are some items in this bill that I am not very happy about. \$1,300,000,000 is in this bill for so-called expediting production, which includes new factories in Government establishments; new machine tools, new machines of all character required for such construction; also the building of some factories to be operated by private industry where the amount involved is so large that it is absolutely impossible for private industry to take it on.

Frankly, there is too much of a spread-out along that line. We have the RFC providing funds for some operations of that character. We have the National Production Authority providing funds, we have the Army providing funds, we have the Navy providing funds, and we have the Air Force providing funds. There is not the coordination that there should be in connection with those operations.

Frankly, I was disturbed as a result of the investigation that was made by the Committee on Expenditures a few weeks ago, that funds have been provided for one concern by both the RFC and the National Production Authority, and without either one knowing that the other was involved. I think we ought to get to the point where there is some semblance of coordination. Frankly, I feel that none of those things should go through without having the approval of someone of the type of Mr. Lovett. He is the strongest character in the defense set-up. I feel that he would go into such questions more thoroughly than anyone connected with the entire organization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In connection with this expedited action would the gentleman explain what the method of operation is? Does the Government build with its own money these plants and retain title to them? Or how do they operate in connection with some concern that is to run the plant?

Mr. TABER. Some of the plants are built by the Government and belong to the Government.

Mr. KEATING. And are paid for entirely by the Government?

Mr. TABER. And are paid for entirely by the Government, and the equipment is also paid for by the Government.

Mr. KEATING. So that in this expediting production figure here that does not involve loans being made by the Defense Department to individual companies—or does it also include items for that?

Mr. TABER. There might be loans; on the other hand, there is a method provided whereby payment is made as they go along for part of the cost of the things that are to be produced, as the contract approaches say 15 percent, 30 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, 90 percent, where they pay regularly up to a certain percentage of the amount that has been earned upon the contract to these companies. Otherwise a company that had a large contract for the construction of tanks running into several hundreds of millions of dollars—and those things do exist—would not be able to finance its operations. Of course, you could hardly expect private industry to go ahead and build a factory and equip it for military construction alone where the probabilities would be that they could not have any business after this war surge died down; and we all know that that is the hope of the people of the United States, that that day will come before too long.

There are a great many cases where it is necessary to provide factories with machine tools, the title to which would stay in the Government and the machine tools would be so installed that they could be taken out at the expiration of the contracts. There is a lot of other machinery that goes in on that basis.

Mr. KEATING. That is the type of activity which the gentleman feels should be under the personal direction of a man like the Under Secretary, Mr. Lovett.

Mr. TABER. It is. I feel also that these loans should have an over-all clearance so that there will not be duplication and that there will not be anything that prudent men would say should not be done. I appreciate that war production is wasteful; I appreciate that you cannot upset industrial establishments all over the country and turn them into the making of war materials without tremendous waste even if it is done in the very best way and with the very best of management. On the other hand, I do not like to see any more of that than is necessary. We do need to have the very best brains possible that we can get to keep that within bounds.

Mr. KEATING. And the opportunities for abuse in this field, with such staggering figures involved, are quite obvious.

Mr. TABER. That is true. I may say that the Appropriations Committee—I do not say this in an individual way—has passed a resolution for a full-scale following up of the operations with as competent people as they have been able to reach. The committee intends to go through with that sort of investigation to see that there is just as little of that sort of waste as is possible.

Mr. KEATING. I hope the gentleman now addressing us is a member of that committee.

Mr. TABER. I took on membership on the Armed Services Committee this year. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] took on that matter because we feel that in this particular situation we must devote ourselves to that item because it involves more money, it involves quick decisions,

and it involves more of a strain than any of the routine operations of the Government entail and we are doing the best we can. If anybody thinks he is complete master of that particular situation, he would not be.

Mr. KEATING. If a master is procurable in this body I am sure the gentleman now speaking to us would fit that role.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if there was any testimony before the committee in regard to this matter of plant expansion relative to the number of applications now on file with NPA by private corporations that want to use their own money for expansion purposes?

Mr. TABER. That came before the committee. That was up for consideration and was reported here, as I remember it, a few days before the last recess in the form of the war agencies' bill. I may be wrong about that. It might have been after the recess. There was quite a considerable amount of that sort of thing that came before the National Production Authority and the Bureau of Internal Revenue where they permit some of those people to amortize the funds that they put in on the basis of 5 years life rather than the routine figures. That also would be subject to abuse if it were not carefully watched and carefully supervised.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I happen to know, in my own city, we have one of the largest foundries in the Northwest. This organization made application, as a matter of fact, on the 24th of January. It has under way a big expansion program, and as of this moment NPA has not given permission to that firm to expand its foundry facilities. Of course, it wants to take advantage of this accelerated amortization, but I see no reason why, if the Government is now coming in at this time asking for a billion dollars for plant expansion, this private firm, using its own money, cannot have its application approved without further delay. There are two such instances in my own city, and I imagine they can be duplicated many times over.

Mr. TABER. That is certainly correct, and it should have attention. If the gentleman will give me a memorandum on that I shall make it my business to immediately take it up with the organization that ought to pass on it and find out why it is they do not take care of that sort of thing, because every dollar we can avoid having the Government put up is a boon to the war effort rather than a drawback.

You see, these terrific expenditures that we are having result from this: Frankly, I have not been the least bashful about telling the people involved what I think. If you appropriate too much money and try to buy too much, you boost the prices out of sight, and you get things in shape where you are not going to be able to get money enough to go around to supply the things we really

need. That was illustrated in some of the operations of the Munitions Board in buying rubber for stockpiling the way they did and buying wool in the way they did. Of course, the wool price was boosted away out of sight as the direct result of the reciprocal trade agreements that destroyed American production of wool at a time when we needed that production very badly. You get into a lot of things of that kind when your coordination is not as good as it should be. Frankly, I spent considerable time with the head of the Munitions Board going over the situation and advising him how to keep it within bounds. It is very necessary that that matter be reviewed regularly and effectively.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. The statement has been made on the floor this morning that no government is prepared for an all-out war at this time. I am not disputing that statement but I would like to know what happened to the \$95,000,000,000 we spent on national defense between 1945 and 1949.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of August 25, and December 15, 1950, under my remarks, there is considerable discussion of that problem. Some of the \$90,000,000,000 which the gentleman referred to was rescinded and returned to the Treasury. Well, it really never had been taken from the Treasury, because when the war was over a lot of that money was recaptured by Congress and was unexpended.

The Congress did over a 4-year period prior to the present fiscal year provide \$48,000,000,000, in round figures, for the Department of Defense. If you got a breakdown of it similar to the breakdown on the chart here, you would see that a large percentage of it was for pay of personnel and for maintenance and operation. You would see that of the \$40,000,000,000 about \$8,000,000,000 was used for buying guns and airplanes and things of that kind and about a couple of billion was spent for research and development. In other words, I should like the gentleman to refer to those remarks of last year, which, in my judgment, contain a very appropriate discussion of what happened to those funds.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. Does the gentleman from Texas defend the policy that only \$1 out of \$7 went for munitions of war?

Mr. MAHON. This is, in a measure, what we must do if we want to keep having the Armed Forces. There are \$8,000,000,000 this year that we are providing in our appropriations for pay, clothing, subsistence, and so forth, of the men in the Armed Forces. If we want to say, "No; we will not spend \$8,000,000,000; we will let these boys go home and we will spend that for airplanes and



guns"; if we want to say, "We do not want to operate and maintain our forces and equipment"; if we want to say that, we can spend billions more for munitions; and if we do not want that research and development, if we want to build obsolete and outmoded equipment, we could cut that out, and things of that kind.

I think a realistic understanding of this question is something that we need to seek. I, for one, would not have dared to recommend that we disband our Army and spend the total appropriation of \$48,000,000,000 for munitions to be put out in warehouses or out in the open air to deteriorate and become obsolete and have nobody to man them. I know the gentleman will completely share that view.

Mr. McVEY. One more question: Let us forget about the boys in the service. We want to provide them with the clothing and food and equipment they need. But what about these civilians in the service? We had one civilian for every two men in uniform. Does the gentleman defend the policy which would put one civilian in the Defense Department for every two men in uniform?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has said he is willing to pay and to clothe and feed our soldiers, and, of course, in that he is entirely correct. In fact, we passed a bill last year that increased the pay of our servicemen by \$500,000,000 annually. That is where part of that money has gone, and is going.

As to defending the policy of having two civilians for every one man in the military, that of course is in error. We have, or rather, will have in excess of 1,000,000 civilians in the Department of Defense at the end of this fiscal year, and we will have about 3,400,000 in the Armed Forces, so the ratio would be nearer 1 to 3.

May I say further that we are seeking in every possible way to get men who are in uniform ready to do service on the field of battle. Wherever a man in uniform can be relieved by a civilian we want to make this military man available to fight for the defense of the country, because we have precious few in uniform compared to a potential enemy, and it behooves us to have civilians doing all the work that civilians can do so that we may relieve the military men for training. We have the civilians making guns down here near Washington in the gun factory. We have them in the arsenals all over the country. Without these civilians, of course, we could not have an effective Military Establishment. I think we have too many. That is one thing we have sought to eliminate. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I and others have worked diligently at that job.

As you know prior to Korea the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, had spoken publicly of his great pride in having reduced the number of civilians in the Military Establishment by something like 150,000 or 200,000 people. The American people seemingly were almost unanimous in approving Mr. Johnson's economy action with respect to civilian personnel. It is a very difficult prob-

lem which the committee has sought to handle as well as possible.

Mr. McVEY. Referring to the ratio of which I spoke a moment ago, I was not referring to the present time, but to the time covered in my original remark, which time was the period between 1945 and 1949, and I believe I am correct in saying that at that time there was one civilian for every two men in the armed services.

Mr. TABER. I think they had too many in the period between 1945 and 1950.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Following VJ-day in 1945 there was carried on a vast destruction of durable war materials, such as the B-29's and other intricate equipment. Has your committee ever found out who was the official responsible for giving those orders?

Mr. TABER. No, but at that time General Eisenhower was the Chief of Staff, and I think, as I remember it, Mr. Patterson was Secretary of War; but I am not sure about it. It might have been after Mr. Johnson took over. I am not sure about that, either.

But there were not very many B-29's destroyed which were good. The good B-29's were put in mothballs. That is what they call it. Just how they put them away I do not know. And they are now in use. I have heard them describe it, but I could not tell you how they do it now. Those were the ones that were destroyed mostly. The good planes that were destroyed were fighting planes. Those planes, or at least in all probability most of them were obsolete and would not have been of any value to us today. They were fighting planes which were in the service during the war. I think we might have done better in salvaging the aluminum and the other materials than we did, and we might have done better in not letting so many of the engines get into the hands of the Russians.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I wish the distinguished gentleman from New York would give the committee some information in regard to the proviso on page 4. Does that proviso have the effect of nullifying the bill which the House passed a few days ago wherein all realty and all matters of this nature should be cleared by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate? This makes available \$400,000,000 for the acquisition of lands and the extension of plants. All those matters are now referred to our committee, and with reference to the Navy particularly under the Act of 1942. This deals with the Navy and I am just somewhat disturbed that this proviso eliminates the necessity of any further compliance with that law.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman give me a little description of what that law provides?

Mr. VINSON. The Act of 1944 requires that all acquisitions and leases for the Navy shall be referred to the Com-

mittee on Armed Services. The other day the House went one step further and carried the same principle through for the Air Force and for the Army. I do not want that statute repealed by this proviso. For instance, now pending before the committee are two very important plants which the Navy contemplates building, costing some \$30,000,000 each. The committee has been requested to give its views to the department and we are taking hearings on that matter now. That kind of thing goes on constantly, and I am a little bit disturbed about this proviso because it says:

That the amount appropriated herein shall be available for expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amount to be used for the expansion of private plants shall not exceed \$400,000,000.

I do not want to nullify that which has been on the statute books since 1944, and for which we have just passed a bill, both through the House and the Senate, extending it to all three branches of the service. I am a little worried about that proviso.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not think our committee had any intention of trying to get around any statute that has been approved by the Armed Services Committee or to get ourselves in a position where we were trying to usurp jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON. Oh, it is not that.

Mr. TABER. I understand, but, frankly, I would not be able to say whether or not that would violate the provisions of that statute. If it does, I would not want it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I share the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that there is no intention here to change the procedure under which we are now operating, which I think is good procedure, that new public-works programs must be cleared by the Armed Services Committee and by the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe that this language will so operate. I want to say for the record that it is not intended that it would operate so. This does have application, in a limited way, to certain plants in the defense production, and this is the kind of thing we have done on numerous other occasions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that right now the Navy Department is asking that some \$30,000,000 be approved for the acquisition of land and the construction of plants in two different communities, and they are waiting for clearance from the committee. I know there is no intention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to get around that provision of the statute, but I am a little apprehensive that this will permit the Navy Department, specifically, to

not be required to come in and get a clearance.

Mr. TABER. I think I can answer the gentleman's question now. My judgment on what is sought to be done is that this waives the statute with reference to the amount that might be expended for a particular site, and that sort of thing. It also allows them to proceed ahead of approval by the Attorney General, but I do not think that it waives the requirement for authority on the part of the Congress which would come from a bill coming from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That is the intention. Now, if the intention has not been carried out, I would be very glad to participate in correcting it.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. I shall ask to insert in my remarks a statement with respect to the matter, which makes clear that it is not the intention of the committee to circumvent the procedure or the law under which we now operate as to clearance.

Mr. TABER. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would give us a memorandum of the data with reference to that statute, and the section, so that we could incorporate it right here in the Record.

I think it should be perfectly clear that it is not the intention, and if there is any doubt about it I think it should be corrected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I came on the floor a little while ago in the midst of the discussion about the number of personnel in the armed services. Did the fact come out as to the number of civilian personnel we have in the armed services?

Mr. TABER. Somewhere over a million, and probably it will increase. There are too many over here at the Pentagon; I am satisfied of that, and there is a very large number in the different arsenals and factories that the Government is operating in connection with the supplying of ammunition and munitions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the distinguished gentlemen from New York and Texas will merely put in the Record that it is not intended that this proviso shall circumvent H. R. 3096 or a Senate bill of the same tenor. That would clear the matter up entirely. I know there is no intention of circumventing that bill but I just do not want the department to think that we have nullified that which we have already enacted.

Mr. TABER. I may say right now that I agree with the gentleman that we have no idea of nullifying the provisions of that bill. I think the gentleman from Texas will say the same thing.

Mr. MAHON. I agree in the statement made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I hear the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] say that he felt the armed services were overstaffed by civilian employees? Did I hear the gentleman say that a little while ago?

Mr. MAHON. I do not know that I said that a while ago. I sometimes think that our offices here on the Hill are overstaffed upon some days when Members have to be here in the House most of the time and do not have opportunity to supervise certain essential work in their offices. Then maybe the very next day we may need for or five extra people. I think the bigger your institution gets the more manpower is wasted. I do not have the slightest doubt but that there is overstaffing in various places in the Department of Defense. With the instrumentalities at our disposal we have sought in every way we could to encourage the weeding out of unnecessary employees. But I am not one who would agree that in every respect there is a business institution in America of any great size, or a governmental institution that is not in some instances overstaffed.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask this question, Was it not to be the duty of the Waves and the Wacs to serve in clerical capacities in the armed services?

Mr. TABER. It was. Frankly, I am of the opinion that a great many of the Waves and Wacs are drawing more pay than the civilian help who might take their places in a good many cases and that we should not build up the Waves and the Wacs with the idea that we would save anything by substituting them for civilian help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Much as we want the Waves and Wacs to perform their functions in substituting for other military personnel in the Defense Establishment, we must realize that personnel that handles heavy machinery in these ammunition plants and factories cannot be supplanted by Waves and Wacs.

The Waves and Wacs certainly can do clerical work, but I venture to guess that in the long run the Waves and Wacs would probably be more expensive than ordinary civilian employees. They can serve in some certain capacities to advantage.

Mr. JENSEN. The thing I am trying to get at is this: We have Waves and Wacs who are supposed to be doing clerical work and we find they are doing chauffeuring and a lot of other things. Then we have over a million civilian employees in the armed services. I would like to know how many of those civilian employees are employed in the arsenals, in the navy yards and other

places where manual labor is performed and who are not in clerical work.

Mr. TABER. This is a guess, not intended as an accurate statement because we did not get as far as that in the overall picture. I would say that probably 800,000 of the over a million employees are engaged in the different navy yards and establishments like the Watervliet Arsenal, the Springfield Arsenal, the Rock Island Arsenal and places like that. There is an enormous number of civilian personnel that are employed in connection with some of the training centers; that is to maintain the training groups. They have even gotten to the point where they have to do the cooking for some of the trainees that are brought in. There is probably 100,000 scattered around in different maintenance jobs of that kind and another 100,000 in the Pentagon. That is my guess as to about how they would be distributed and my guess is as good as anyone's unless we have accurate figures. We will have those figures when we come in here with the regular appropriation bill and we will then know exactly what that picture is. We had no opportunity here to get out any picture except where an individual item was presented to us. Out of the many items that are in the regular annual bill we probably have not covered over 30 percent of those items in this bill, so that we have not had the opportunity to get those details in shape so that we can answer an over-all question of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. You will have them before the regular bill comes to the floor?

Mr. TABER. When the other bill comes here we will have them.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman give some information in regard to the item on page 2, line 18, welfare of enlisted men, \$500,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. My information has always been that the welfare funds were made up from the PX's, the post exchanges and organizations of that kind, and that we have never made any direct appropriation for a welfare fund. Am I correct?

Mr. TABER. No. We have made appropriations regularly for the welfare fund. Some of it has been in the nature of libraries, some of it has been in the nature of special-training programs and Army troop publications.

Mr. VINSON. There is precedent for it then.

Mr. TABER. Well, there was, I think, in the Army statute. The information came to me that it was thought that the consolidation bill wiped out that authority. Frankly, I do not know but I have asked someone to try and find out for me so that we might have an opportunity to read it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. In the regular bill, the first and second supplemental, we provided, I believe, \$18,000,000 for welfare of enlisted men. We have taken in more men than had been anticipated at the



time those bills were passed, or provided for in those bills, and this \$500,000 is to take up that slack, and it provides such things as baseballs and baseball bats and gloves and equipment that will increase the morale, and so forth. Now it is true that through the PX's and through other sources, supplementary funds have been and are now raised. The PX's have been restricted in their operations, but at all times since I have been a member of the committee we have provided for the welfare of the enlisted men.

Mr. VINSON. May I ask this question, with the gentleman's permission? Then as I understand, there is authorization for the Army and the Air Force for appropriations, but no authorization for the Navy.

Mr. MAHON. I am not able at the moment to answer the question.

Mr. TABER. The Navy always did have an item of welfare for enlisted men and it was always carried. It may not be at the present time, but it always used to be. I know, because I have been on that subcommittee and reported bill after bill with those provisions in. To my mind there was very grave doubt as to any justification in the hearings for this item. I felt they made no justification because their expenditures and their obligations did not make the picture look like they needed the money.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to cite for the Record, in connection with this discussion, from the act of June 5, 1942, chapter 340, title 50, section 671 which does authorize the Secretary of War to provide such funds, but I am not clear as to the Navy. The Navy program has varied from time to time.

Mr. VINSON. My understanding is, I will say to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from New York, that the welfare money for the Navy comes from the exchanges. I do not recall any statutory authorization for direct appropriations, but that is foreign to the subject because this relates only to the Army.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In this bill there is a billion dollars plus for plant expansion; is that right?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee give consideration to cut-backs of civilian production to take care of the necessity for this plant expansion of a billion dollars? In other words, I understand that an automobile manufacturer is going to erect a new plant building for the production of tanks. Why not cut back on the production of cars?

Mr. TABER. Some of the car production is being cut down and tanks are being produced in those facilities. That takes care of a part of the requirements, more especially as I understand and remember it, on the medium tanks. But, as to some of the larger tank producers and some of the larger airplane factories there did not exist, according to the story that came to me, the facilities for

the construction of enough tanks to supply the demand.

Let me give you a little picture of the philosophy on which this estimate has been gotten up. The thought was that it would be much better for our Government to have considerable facilities for the manufacture of ammunition, munitions, tanks, planes, and that sort of thing, rather than go ahead and attempt to manufacture pell-mell with two or three shifts and a lot of high-priced overtime, a tremendous stockpile of planes, guns, and ammunition and all sorts of things like that, that might get out of date and get so they would not be worth anything to the armed services. That has resulted in more plant expansion.

As I stated earlier, I believe the closest scrutiny ought to be given by the armed services to the items that are requested for that purpose. I serve notice right now that as far as I am concerned I shall want a very strict accounting of that sort of thing and of the things they use the money for, as well as the other items that are appropriated for here.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman's concern, as it is the concern of other Members of the House, is that we do not go on and do what we did before, spend hundreds of millions, perhaps billions of dollars for plants, and equip them, and then sell the plants and equipment at the end of the emergency for a few cents on the dollar. Let us not get into that again.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make the very decided statement he did, that it is his intention to watch very carefully from now on how the military establishment expends the funds this Congress gives it. The gentleman will recall that several times we have brought this up in the full committee. Several of us urged just the other day in the full committee that the Armed Services Legislative Committee keep very close watch upon these many billions of dollars we are forced to make available. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that here, if anywhere, the various committees of the House concerned need a real staff so as to be able to follow up this expenditure?

Mr. TABER. I do not think this expenditure can be watched too closely by the Congress. I think we need to do everything possible to cover it. Frankly, I know that even in spite of that there will be enormous waste, but we should have just as little of it as possible. This bill calls for an end strength of the Army of 1,550,000. And as I understand it they have about 100,000 short of that currently. It calls for an end strength for the Navy of 735,000, which as I understand includes 204,000 for the marines. They are practically up to that figure now. That is, the marines are practically up to that figure now.

It calls for an end strength in the Air Force of 850,000 and an over-all end strength of 3,339,000 men. That

includes officers and enlisted men and warrant officers.

The various items appear in the report. I will not take the time to go into the details of them, but I am sure that we can answer any questions within reason about the items which have to be taken care of.

The item for construction and procurement of aircraft is very largely for new facilities to cover that sort of thing.

The items for ships and facilities was considerable there for that sort of thing in the Navy.

In the Air Corps the item for aircraft and related procurement, \$700,000,000, has a very considerable item for that purpose.

There are no items here for the establishment of new airplane bases, new barracks, or new real property being acquired for the purpose of setting that sort of thing up except in the Air Force where there is \$300,000,000. The items have been screened as carefully as they could be by the committee. Some items have been cut down very markedly as a result of that screening before they have been presented to you here on the floor of the House.

Frankly I have not any intention at the moment of offering any motion to reduce, because I believe we are going to need the things which are set out in the bill here for the Armed Forces at least we have the obligation by the end of this fiscal year. I believe it is going to continue to cost us a very considerable sum of money as we go along.

This year's appropriations presently, as I understand it, total about \$42,000,000,000. With this figure it will be about forty-eight and one-half billion to forty-nine billion dollars, and our expenditures may run as high as twenty-one or twenty-two billion dollars before we get through. We may run to \$25,000,000,000 if the production begins to roll out of the factories.

The large expenditures next year will come as a result of the personnel being in the Army, Navy, and Air Force for a longer period and the requirement for operations of a larger force such as we are going to have.

I want to call attention to the statements with reference to the Sampson Naval Training Station which appear on pages 445 and 446 and subsequently in the hearings with reference to the Sampson Air Force Base and the construction thereof.

I first called attention of the subcommittee to this late in January and General Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, at the request of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, went up to Sampson and went over the situation. He found a lot of overtime—one man claiming to have worked three successive days for 23½ hours a day. For 1 week's work he received \$543. This was such outlandish situation that it compelled General Pick to reduce the number of hours that might be worked to 60 hours per week and that was further reduced to 54 hours and presently has been reduced to 48 hours per week so that these outrageous costs could not happen again.

There is presently in process another investigation by General Pick with the idea of running down other complaints of gross mismanagement and I am satisfied that the general intends to see that the base is put on a decent basis and that excessive costs to the Government are eliminated and to see that the contractors involved pay their bills to their employees.

I am sure that the operations of the committee have saved the Government a considerable sum of money in connection with this job and their work will result in very considerable savings to the Government and to the expediting of the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the extended remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I shall speak only briefly.

As has been pointed out, this fourth supplemental bill carries with it a total for the Armed Services of approximately \$6,400,000,000. If we add that to the sum of approximately \$41,800,000,000 already made available during the fiscal year, it brings the appropriations for fiscal 1951 up to \$48,200,000,000.

Of this total \$10,400,000,000 will go to the Army; \$12,300,000,000 will go to the Navy; \$15,800,000,000 will go to the Air Force; and something over a half billion dollars will go to the Office of Secretary of Defense.

In the present bill there is recommended \$2,800,000,000 for the Army; \$1,600,000,000 for the Navy; and \$1,900,000,000 for the Air Force.

It has been stated that it was originally contemplated to request the Congress at this time for the sum of \$9,600,000,000, and that this figure was subsequently reduced by about 33 percent, with a view to taking care of minimum needs up to July 1, and to permitting consideration by the subcommittee of the programs contemplated in fiscal 1952 before undertaking commitments in this connection.

I want to emphasize in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the sums now under consideration have been certified as adequate to meet minimum needs of the armed services up to July 1, the beginning of the next fiscal year, under the conditions prevailing at the time of the testimony by the chiefs of staff of all three branches of the armed services and by other high-ranking officers.

You will find statements to this effect by General Collins, by Admiral Sherman, by General Vandenberg, by General Cates, and by others included in the hearings.

Of course, should it become necessary, it would be possible to expedite the obligation of funds included in the over-all requests for 1952, which it is hoped will shortly be before your subcommittee for consideration.

It has been pointed out that the strength of military personnel provided for as a result of this bill will amount in the aggregate, as of June 30, 1951, to 3,339,000.

One million five hundred and fifty thousand of this total will be in the Army; 735,000 will be in the Navy; 204,000 will be in the Marine Corps; and the balance of 850,000 will be in the Air Force.

The record indicates that this bill will make possible about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of wings for the air service; about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of planes for the Navy; and about 90 percent in terms of our present objective in number of ships for the Navy.

Sixty-three million nine hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars is provided for the activation of 34 vessels for the Navy and Weather Patrol; \$137,000,000 is provided for the construction or conversion of 17 ships under the construction and conversion program authorized March 10, 1951.

This bill is required in broad terms: First, because of the increased strength in military personnel to which I have referred; second, because of the increase in productive capacity designed not only to supply our forces in being but also to permit very much greater production almost immediately in case that should at any time become necessary; and third, because of the increase in costs throughout the Nation.

The bill under consideration is really equivalent to a first installment of the 1952 appropriation bill, which will of course contain requests greatly in excess of those now under consideration.

The bill is submitted in the interest of expedition. The subcommittee has given it as much consideration as possible in the time available. I agree, however, with the statements made this morning to the effect that far greater and far more detailed consideration will be called for when the 1952 requests are submitted to your subcommittee.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services has a tremendous responsibility, Mr. Chairman. Every possible step must be taken to assure that all possible waste or unnecessary expenditure is eliminated from the requests that will shortly be submitted.

Just to mention one or two sources of possible waste, I call attention to the report by Senator BYRD acting as chairman of the Joint Committee on Non-essential Federal Expenditures, under date of April 3, 1951.

In that report it is pointed out that civilian employment in the Military Establishment has been increasing at the rate of about one thousand a day ever since March 1950. It is further pointed out that in the month of February 1951 the civilian personnel increased to the tune of 18,136 in the Army; of 17,251 in the Navy; and of 17,416 in the Air Force; bringing the over-all total as of the end of February to 1,009,678.

That total is expected to increase to about 1,046,737 as of June 30 next.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the Army advises us that as of February 28, 1951, the ratio of civilian to military personnel was 1 to 3.17. That is one civilian on the rolls for every three and seventeen one-hundredths of military personnel. This is a little better than on June 1, 1950, when the ratio was 1 to 2.37, but it is a greater ratio than was maintained at the peak of World War II when the ratio was 1 to something over 4.

Moreover, I have here a statement prepared for me in this connection in respect to other armies of the world. This statement is marked "secret." I do not know why. Similar figures I am quite certain have been published. In any event the statement shows that our ratio is higher than the ratio of any one of the other 5 armies referred to, one of which having a ratio as low as 1 civilian to 14 military personnel.

I think this is a matter that must be gone into with great care when the 1952 requests are presented, with a view to seeing if we are not carrying a civilian personnel which is excessive.

The matter of expediting construction has been referred to.

On April 9 when the third supplemental appropriation bill was before the House I called attention to statements included in the April 1 report of Mr. Wilson, Administrator of Defense Mobilization, and to his testimony before the Appropriations Committee dealing in general with the steps being taken with a view to expediting production.

I pointed out among other things that Mr. Wilson indicated that up to April 1 about \$2,700,000,000 had been authorized in terms of accelerated amortization; that an obligation of about \$128,000,000 had been assumed in terms of guaranteed loans; and that he anticipated that about \$1,600,000,000 would be required by the end of the current fiscal year in terms of direct loans, purchase agreements, and for equipment and the making ready of essential plants.

I emphasized at the time the impact which this large sum of money could have on our economy and the dangers of abuse, but apparently this was only a beginning.

If I read the hearings correctly, including this bill there will have been authorized for the purpose of expediting production in the present fiscal year through the Army about \$1,100,000,000, through the Navy about \$756,000,000, and through the Air Force about \$779,000,000—an over-all total of something like \$2,600,000,000 apparently in addition to the totals given us a few weeks ago by the Administrator of Defense Mobilization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any provision for bringing the men back, rotating the men, who are in Korea? I am told that never in all our history has there been a situation like



the number of months that the men have had to stay on the firing line in Korea.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that all branches of the service have either in operation or in contemplation plans for rotation of those in Korea.

The Army's plan has been in operation since about the 15th of the month. It has been expected before long to send home about 20,000 soldiers a month. That, of course, is dependent on the general conditions in Korea.

The Marine Corps also has a plan in operation. About 3,300 have been returned from Korea—1,700 more have been expected before the end of the month.

Returning to the matter of expediting construction, I want to add that since the testimony received by your subcommittee I have been in contact with the Office of Defense Mobilization trying to get an over-all picture but, without success. I hope and expect to have one before long. I gather from the Administrator's office that the picture is not yet available; that it is considered very important that it should be available; and that it is believed that the activity as a whole should be coordinated by someone, presumably by the Administrator of Defense Mobilization, with a view among other things to eliminating waste and possible abuse, and to controlling the effects of this activity upon our economy as a whole.

The acquisition and construction of real property, Mr. Chairman, is another field that will call for the closest possible scrutiny. This applies to all branches of the service and to all questions that arise in this field, including type of project, type of construction, costs, and ways and means to effect economies.

The Members will find in the course of the hearings an account of the operations of a so-called citizens committee appointed to aid the Air Force in affecting economies in respect to some 300 projects aggregating in estimated cost, I believe, something over \$5,500,000,000. That committee believes it has been able to suggest practical means of affecting savings which may run as high as a billion dollars.

The opportunity for savings in this field was emphasized very much, to my mind, as a result of an inspection of certain installations in Georgia and Florida recently undertaken by members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the armed services.

Purchases by the quartermaster and other departments is another field that requires closest scrutiny. Members will find in the hearings questions raised by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] in respect to enormous purchases made of various commodities, often over very short periods of time, raising the question whether the size of the purchases has or has not been justified, and the further question, if justified, if they could not have been better made over a longer period of time with less effect on the markets for the commodities in question.

These are simply examples, Mr. Chairman, of items in this tremendously large

and tremendously important field in respect to which the most careful consideration must be given if we are to have the assurance that all possible waste and extravagance is eliminated from the picture.

I am going along with this bill, Mr. Chairman. I am going along with it because I believe, as I have already stated, that in substance it is only a small first installment of the 1952 appropriation request. I am going along with it because I believe that speed in respect to building up our armed services is absolutely vital.

We must make America strong at the earliest possible moment. We must build our armed strength up to that point which is necessary to deter any other nation who might otherwise be foolhardy enough to precipitate a worldwide conflict.

The peace of the world, Mr. Chairman, in the last analysis, is dependent upon the military strength of America and of our allies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has well stated, this is simply a forerunner, the first bill of several that will come before us in connection with the fiscal 1952 defense appropriations. This is really the beginning of the activities for fiscal 1952.

I think it is very essential at this time that Congress decide just how closely we intend to watch the expenditure of all these huge sums of money. We quibble and fight for days on end over the Interior Department appropriation bill, for example. I presume there will be struggles over the regular appropriation bill for Agriculture when that hits the floor. We will fight over the elimination of a few million dollars. But here all at once we dump \$6,400,000,000 into the laps of the military.

The subcommittee in charge has given it as thorough scrutiny as they have been able, because of limited time. Here today we spend a couple of hours, discussing the main features, and with scarcely 20 percent of the membership on the floor, will send it over to the Senate. We are really operating in the dark on a bill of this magnitude. More of us should show an interest in the expenditure of over \$6,000,000,000.

I was disturbed the other day when I went down to Fort Belvoir on a little tour of inspection. I noticed the barracks there looked very unkempt. I asked the officer who was showing me around, "Why don't you people get a little paint and give the boys in these companies an opportunity to brighten up their own living quarters and do away with this drab appearance?" His answer to me startled me. He said that because of local influence or interference it would never do for the boys of the service themselves to put a little paint on those buildings because they might infringe upon the rights of some local painters' union. This seems absurd to me.

I have heard sordid tales about what is going on up in Anchorage, Alaska, where threatened strikes have slowed up construction of necessary facilities.

I am beginning to wonder if in this huge national defense picture we, the Congress of the United States, or the labor unions are going to write the ticket.

When I glance at page 543 of the hearings and when I see, according to the statement by the very efficient clerk of the subcommittee, Mr. Lambert, that such a thing can be allowed to occur as evidently did where a man worked 10 hours a day, Monday through Thursday, and then worked 23½ hours a day each for the following Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and then worked 10 hours on the Monday following, I agree with the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], when he states that that is a deliberate fraud upon the taxpayers of the United States to permit any such happenings. Certainly no man could put in 23½ hours a day for three consecutive days and be worth what the taxpayers put up for that overtime.

Turn over to page 545 in connection with this Sampson Air Force base rehabilitation. We find the administrative payroll for the 1 week set forth there. Look at page 545 and see for yourself where in 1 week, Arnold Kagan, president, receives \$1,000 for his end of it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman this question, and the gentleman please will understand that I am not trying to create an embarrassing situation, but when you consider the position of the members of our subcommittee, I do not think you can find three men more seriously interested in the concept of serving the American taxpayers and protecting their interests than the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I certainly have not inferred anything to the contrary.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I realize that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think we have some of our very best men on the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. That applies to both sides of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In reference to the painters' situation, that subject matter was brought before our committee through the diligence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The committee went into it very seriously and found discrepancies there beyond the pale of acceptability. There is no question about that. But when you are dealing with the total of manpower that is involved, I mean numerically speaking, you are bound to have this union equation injected into it. I can assure the gentleman we are doing the very best we can to see that these expenditures are

properly applied and that expenditures are curtailed to the nth degree. I really mean that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is the sole purpose of my remarks. We do not want to come here about 5 years from now, may I say to the gentleman from California, and then say we wished we had done something toward preventing waste. The time, as you well know—and I have heard you often plead for economy in these expenditures—the time to do it is now, and we should watch it now. Certainly I think you will agree with me it is up to the Congress of the United States, through the proper subcommittee, not alone the legislative Committee on the Armed Services but also some committee having to do with appropriations, to watch this very carefully.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What I am trying to say to the gentleman is that we are watching as carefully as we can under the conditions that exist.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know you are. I am not criticizing your subcommittee. All I want to do is to bring this whole thing out into the clean sunlight of day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But referring to the painting situation which the gentleman referred to, I will admit there is an apparent discrepancy there in that situation. However, we have to comply with the law that is laid down by the Congress when it comes to military personnel doing work of that kind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I realize that, but is there any reason why the Committee on Armed Services, the legislative committee, cannot bring something before the Congress to alleviate any such conditions as far as too much union-labor control over what is expended is concerned?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In my opinion, the gentleman has touched on a topic that is within the province and jurisdiction of another committee of the House. I think in calling attention to it he is doing a great service.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That was just a little observation on my part, as illustrating what I am trying to bring out today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the very good chairman of this committee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is very kind. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota would not for a moment want men in the Armed Forces, who supposedly are training for a very tough war, to utilize much of their time working as carpenters, plumbers, and bricklayers, and getting the pay of privates in the military service. In other words, we do not want these boys to spend too much of their time that way, and particularly at reduced rates of pay. I am sure the gentleman feels the same way and I do not want to misrepresent the gentleman's position. But I want to make clear that his position is as I have stated; and, incidentally, if servicemen want to do some of this work—and they have done much of the work here and there throughout the country—

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I answer the gentleman? I have tried to put myself in the place of some of these boys in one of those companies in a particular barracks. I think if I were they, rather than to live in one of those barracks perhaps for 3 months, in that drab, colorless building, I would be glad to put in an evening or two, along with 20 or 30 of the others, brightening it up with a little paint. We should not have to secure the approval of some labor union just to make the living quarters a little more attractive.

Mr. MAHON. And they have done that in many instances. I am sorry that they have not done it at Belvoir and the places to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But, getting back to this pay roll on page 545, detailing the exorbitant weekly salaries drawn by the officials of the contracting company. It may cost the Government of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars unless we do something to correct things of this nature. If you will turn to page 545, you will notice the salaries that the men in connection with this particular company pull down weekly. One thousand dollars, I repeat, to Mr. Arnold Kagan. One thousand dollars to Mr. Sid Feldman. Six hundred dollars to Mr. Nathan Cohen; \$500 to Mr. Edward Feldman; \$500 to Mr. Hyman J. Feldman; \$250 to Mr. Sol Feldman. So far it looks like a family affair. Two hundred and fifty dollars to Mr. Irving Feldman, and \$200 a week to Mr. Nathan Cohen. After all, the people of the United States are paying that bill. You cannot tell me that it is necessary to pay up to \$4,500 a month to two of these officials on a small construction job. Contracts of this kind should be examined very carefully. I am pointing out this instance as an example of what I mean when I say it is our responsibility to keep a vigilant check on the expenditures of these billions of dollars. This bill is necessary and we must pass it, but at the same time let us guard against waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If there is fraud in this business, why is not the Department of Justice doing something about it? Do they have to have their noses rubbed in it?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not saying that there is fraud. I am calling this to the attention of the Congress now, rather than 5 years from now. I think it is our responsibility, through the various committees of this Congress, to make sure that we do not dump unnecessary billions of dollars down the sewer to accomplish what we must accomplish, and that is, preparation against any prospect of all-out war.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman. Defense funds are no

more sacred than any other funds voted by the Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Absolutely. The military must watch their expenditures very carefully. We are now serving notice we will scrutinize what they do.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I might tell the gentleman that the House Committee on Armed Services is looking into the very contract he spoke about.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is fine. I want to compliment the gentleman. I hope it continues.

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. CHURCH. I regret that there are not more Members present today to discuss a bill containing \$6,400,000,000. As the gentleman from Minnesota states, we must support it; nevertheless it does seem to me we should guard against waste. We want our armed services to have everything they need, but not one dollar more.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the lady for her observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who just preceded me, made approximately the same statements before the full committee. One of the statements he left up in the air this afternoon was: Are you going to allow the labor unions or the Congress of the United States to run this country?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I should like to have that question answered, if the gentleman will answer it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think the question is worth answering because the gentleman has just made a 7-, 8-, or 10-minute speech, but has given very little information that would benefit the Members of Congress here this afternoon.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. He is my good friend. I may say that the gentleman from Minnesota feels that he has accomplished something because it has brought the gentleman from Rhode Island to his feet.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; the only reason I asked for time was that I would like to get some factual information, and that is something I have not yet got and did not get in the full committee in this matter of employment. I am not discussing it on a personal basis with my friend from Minnesota, because I have served with him on subcommittees before and we have gotten along very well together.

He made a statement about the boys in the barracks at Fort Belvoir not being able to paint their own barracks because of political interference in and around



Camp Belvoir. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that if there is any person holding public office within 25 or 50 miles of Fort Belvoir, elected by the people in that vicinity, who is pro labor, I would like to know it; I would like to know one such man that has been elected to public office in that vicinity.

Furthermore, I believe I am correct when I say that Fort Belvoir is now a permanent installation. In all the permanent installations in this country they have a public works department and they have civil service employees who are working at civil service rates. They do their own painting, plumbing, heating, and all repairs. I know there is some restriction on the amount that a new building may cost or on an addition exceeding a certain size if it is built new and that it should be built by outside contractors and so forth. Whether that is a matter of statute law or some regulation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff I do not know, but I know it existed in the last world war and I also know that attempts have been made from time to time to get these boys in the service to do the work. As the gentleman from Texas so well said, during the last war they gave exactly the same answer that they gave to you this afternoon—why should an enlisted man being paid \$30, \$50, or \$60 a month, whatever he is getting, be required to do work that is being paid for at the rate of \$12 to \$15 a day on the outside? I know that such situations existed during the last world war.

Now as to the case in Alaska, we could not get any factual information about that the other morning. There has been no information come to this committee or to the Members of Congress this afternoon as to the labor unions entering into this controversy at Fort Belvoir. I do not know of any. It does not exist in my part of the country.

And then you refer to a job that has been let at Camp Sampson up in Sampson, N. Y. I do not know the particulars about that job, but as far as I know that was a job that was given to a company on a cost-plus or fixed-fee basis; and we know by experience during the last war that on those contracts given to contractors on a cost-plus or a fixed-fee basis there was no way of controlling the profits. I believe that is something the appropriate authorities should look into. That is something that I do not believe should be allowed to go on. I think that every contract that is given out for repairs or rehabilitation, or for new building should be let on a competitive bid basis. Then we would not have the situation that exists at Camp Sampson at the present time because when a contract is let on competitive bids, the successful bidder must finish the job even though he loses money. But in this particular instance the only way you are going to get costs down is by handling it by the proper Federal authorities whether it is by civil engineers in the public works department of the Navy or whoever it might be was in charge of the particular job.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. During the time of my service on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments it came to the attention of the committee that during World War II many so-called temporary-type barracks were built, that the barracks in some of these camps have been allowed to deteriorate due to lack of attention. I firmly believe from my own experience it is a mistake to put up these temporary wooden so-called shacks during this period of rehabilitating many of our camp sites.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the policy that the Army is using with regard to building new barracks, whether they are to build more of these wooden shacks or whether they are going to really put up good, permanent, fireproof-type of barracks that will not be a constant source of expense and that in the long run will be less expensive than this wooden type of construction. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree 100 percent with what the gentleman said. Up in my own district where we have one of the largest air bases in the country, in the last war, and especially in the Seabee base, there were temporary buildings built, but they were built out of cinder block and brick. They are still standing although they have not been used in 4 or 5 years. They are as good as they were when they were built 8 or 9 years ago. I do not believe we should put up this temporary-type construction. We should put up some permanent type of construction that will stay for years. The upkeep on that type of construction is almost nil.

Mr. HARVEY. Would not the gentleman agree with me that the ultimate cost of these types of fireproof permanent construction barracks is actually less than that of building the so-called temporary wooden-type barracks?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the original cost is concerned, I do not know, but I do know that in the long run they would be less over a period of years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman would not approve of there being charged to the Government salaries like the one paid to Arnold Kagan, president of the construction company, \$1,000 a week; Sid Feldman, vice president, \$1,000 a week; Nathan Cohen, secretary, \$600 a week; Edward Feldman, assistant project manager, \$500; Hyman J. Feldman, another assistant manager, \$500; and that sort of thing?

Mr. FOGARTY. I certainly do not think they should be, but as long as you are going to allow them to let these contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis you will run into the same thing which happened in the last war and is happening again. It is only about 3 weeks ago that I made a speech on the floor that Government contracts are being given out now to people like General Motors, Ford, and General Electric.

Ninety-nine percent of all these defense contracts have been given out to big business on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. Many of them will be subject to renegotiation, however, under the law that we have passed and will be renegotiated, but at the present time there is not 1 percent of all the defense contracts that have been given up to the present time that have gone to small business.

We in this Congress have not done one single thing to force the defense officials of this country to give out these contracts, to parcel out these contracts to small business in the country and we are not going to be able to make them do it unless we take the same action we did in 1940, 1941, or 1942 when we established the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It was not until then that the small businesses of this country got a fair break in the original or prime contracts that were given out by the Government. Until we take action on a bill that was introduced 6, 7, 8, or 9 weeks ago—I do not know just when it was introduced—or enact similar legislation, we can get up here and talk day in and day out about what they ought to do and how they ought to do it. They are not going to do it until we force them to do it by legislation as we did during the First World War.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think my colleague will agree that at least it is a healthy sign when we bring up things of this nature for open discussion on the floor.

Mr. FOGARTY. Positively.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is all I am aiming to do. Let us discuss these things, and if there is anything wrong let us find out what is wrong.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not like to deal with generalities. I like to deal with facts and figures presented to us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is absolutely right about small business being given the run-around. But, who appointed these defense officials?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not make any difference who appointed them; it would not make any difference at all.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. They come from big business. It does not make any difference who appoints them. It is up to the Congress who appropriates the money when they are giving out these contracts. Congress should have something to say as to who should be given some break in these contracts that are being let and thrown all around the country at the present time, and it is up to us, I think, to enact legislation to force them to do it. That is what we are up against.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the administration in power was the administration of the little people.

Mr. FOGARTY. The administration in power has done more for the little

people of this country than the Republican administration did in a hundred years previous to 1932, but I think that they have been misled in some of the leadership that they have at the present time, men of your particular party, like Mr. Wilson and others, whose company, during the last war, got the major portion of all these defense contracts and now is in the saddle here in Washington and is refusing to recognize little business which, in my opinion, is the backbone of the economy of the country. He has refused to recognize them, and he is a member of your party.

Mr. GROSS. I was not aware of the fact that the Republicans selected Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FOGARTY. They sure did not select him, but I believe the President of the United States, when he selected him, that his selection met with the universal approval over on your side, because he was one of your party. I do not believe there is a man the President appointed that received more universal approval on your side of the aisle than Mr. Wilson did when he was appointed by the President of the United States.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of getting some information from my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. In the full committee yesterday the gentleman will remember that I asked about the item called "Construction of Ships, Navy," the amount of which is \$137,000,000, and I asked whether this was entirely to be used for the construction of Navy ships. I understood, and I was assured in the full committee that it was.

Now I wish the gentleman would turn to page 731 of the hearings beginning with the question asked by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] of Admiral Wallin about an expenditure of \$5,000,000 to put the *United States*, that is, the large vessel, into commission as a troop transport:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. \* \* \* Will that complete the job on the *United States*, that \$5,000,000?

Admiral WALLIN. No, sir.

Later on Admiral Wallin said:

Because the Maritime Administration has charge of this work and the organizational arrangement is that they do the conversion and the plans and everything connected with this type of work, and we reimburse them.

It seems to me that it is a curious thing for the Subcommittee on Armed Services to bring in in this budget an item for the Maritime, which is actually a Maritime Commission budget item.

I am not raising a jurisdictional point here. We are not jealous of the work of the Committee on Armed Services. But looking back over a few years, it has been possible in our subcommittee to put the Maritime Commission into good book-keeping, to make it reduce its costs, to carry on a very careful check. I see no such check in any of the hearings here and no attempt to make such a check, simply the rather free and easy appro-

priation of \$5,000,000 with the assurance that if the Commission needs more it is to come back and get it.

Just when did the Navy take over the Maritime Commission? Also, if you go down to the bottom of page 732 you will find that you have in here \$3,275,000 for the activation of the weather patrol. Then we have the following:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is the Coast Guard under the Navy at the moment?

Admiral LEGGETT. No, sir.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Why does not the Coast Guard come up here and ask for its own money instead of having the Navy Department come in here for this money?

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is easier to get the money for the Navy, for defense purposes, than to explain it for another purpose, is that it?

Admiral LEGGETT. No, sir; I do not think that is quite true. I think this is in connection with Pacific operations where the Coast Guard and the Weather Bureau normally would not have any particular interest in providing that information to the general public.

It does seem to me that the gentleman's committee is establishing a precedent which is a little bit outside of the procedures of the Committee on Appropriations. Perhaps without any attempt to press the jurisdictional point, certainly not to defend the rights of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I do say that a subcommittee which is thoroughly familiar with the operations of an agency is much better able to tell from experience how much money to give that agency to do a certain job, and it is better for that subcommittee to handle it than for some other agency of the Government, the Navy, in this instance, to come down to some other subcommittee and ask for a sum of money for the Maritime Commission, with which the second subcommittee has not previously dealt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. Will he use the time to answer my questions?

Mr. MAHON. The subcommittee is fortunate in having on it the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who formerly served for many years on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, which handled the Maritime Commission. As I recall, he was formerly the chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We regret very much to lose him, but he is not on that subcommittee now.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will note, the gentleman from Massachusetts took particular interest in the hearings in this particular item. But it did not seem to me irregular to provide money to the Navy to provide repairs for ships of the Navy, that is, ships to be used by the Navy. This work is not being done for the Maritime Commission or for the Coast Guard, it is to be done for the Navy, and it would seem irregular to do it otherwise. However, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the able chairman of the gentleman's subcom-

mittee, is on the floor, and if there are any different views, I am sure we will all be glad to hear them. It does not seem irregular to have the Navy, which wants certain Navy work done for the defense of the country, ask for the funds and justify the funds for that purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hold a different view. I wonder if the gentleman realizes the goal to which his own argument leads, that is, that anything which may be considered for the defense of the country should be handled by his subcommittee rather than by other subcommittees which may have jurisdiction over the agencies involved. Why do you not take over the atomic energy appropriation? That certainly is for the defense of the country. You are going to shoot off these atomic energy heads when you get them. Why do you not take over that appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's logic is somewhat strained.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is not my logic, it is the gentleman's logic.

Mr. MAHON. Anything that is going to be done by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force directly in their programs and that is a part of their budget estimate should be justified, certainly, before us. I do not think the gentleman could quarrel with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, and yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. I think the point that our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is raising is simply this: We realize in this instance you are spending Navy funds, but the Maritime Commission will more or less call the signals on the work. As our colleague from California has pointed out, the subcommittee dealing with the Maritime Commission is endeavoring to carefully watch the expenditure of their funds. So may I say to my friend from California that what it looks like is simply this, that the Maritime Commission is spending \$5,000,000 of the Navy's money and the upshot of it is that the gentleman from California and other members of the committee are going to have to look a little bit harder at that expenditure in the future.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

#### DODGING RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, frequently from the well of the House there are admissions that our money is being wasted and spent extravagantly. Every time attention is called to that waste or extravagance someone on the majority side says it is the fault of the Republicans. Since 1923 Republicans have been in power just 2 years, and during that period they balanced the budget, reduced taxation. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] just a moment ago, if I understood him correctly, charged the



waste in this incident which has been under discussion to the Republicans and then he named Mr. Wilson as the man who was not treating small-business men fairly. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] remarked, the Republicans did not appoint Mr. Wilson; the Republicans did not confirm him. Apparently the labor unions cannot lead him around by the nose. The ease with which you gentlemen slip out from under the result of your administration's incompetency, and worse, is most amazing. I hope that if the Republicans ever get into power they will be able to dodge responsibility for their acts with equal facility. I do not expect we can ever do it. It will take long, long years of practice and if we become as corrupt as the Democratic—no, not the Democratic, but the New Deal—Party has become, we sure will be ousted, and I hope right quickly.

We are honest now, as I have tried to tell you before. We could not be otherwise. We have no influence to sell and nobody with any money approaches us. The crooks are too smart for that. Moreover, the present outfit in power are experienced experts without conscience or scruples.

Now, about these two bills, the one for the Department of the Interior that we just laid aside, and the one for the Department of Defense which is under consideration.

#### ACHESON AN UNSAFE ADVISER

Mr. Chairman, because the executive department is a collection of departments and agencies, supposedly coordinating and working together, the success of each somewhat dependent upon the way in which other departments and agencies conduct their affairs, it is well that in considering this appropriation bill we take a look at the manner in which some of the other agencies are operating and at the individuals who direct those agencies' activities.

The Department of the Interior deals with our domestic front, but because our domestic policies must be successfully implemented in order that we may carry out our foreign policies, it is well that we consider the foreign policies we seem to have adopted and those who are administering them, this so that we will not unnecessarily assume a burden which will wreck us, and that we avoid, insofar as we can avoid, indirectly becoming involved or continuing to be involved in a foreign policy which may tend to impair our national security.

We cannot permit the activities of one department to ruin our—at the moment—chief objective, the winning of the war.

At the moment we are engaged in world war III. We became involved in that war without a declaration of war by the Congress—on the order of the President of the United States. That war is being fought under the direction of the United Nations, on which we hold one seat, have one vote. Eleven other nations having an equal vote, an equal voice, but the 11 other nations combined contributing but 10 percent of the fighting men, but 10 percent or less of the munitions of war.

So far no one has in simple language told the American people the objectives of that war.

The Congress, more specifically the Senate and the President, should determine our foreign policy. When in war, the President with the cooperation of the Congress, should outline the objectives of the war, objectives which when attained will mark the end of the war, the beginning of peace.

True, the President is the spokesman for the Nation when our relations with other nations are involved; but from a practical standpoint, while the President and the Senate may determine our foreign policy, nevertheless, without the cooperation of the House—more important yet—without the full support and cooperation of the people, no foreign policy can be successfully implemented.

Wars when once declared are usually directed by military experts.

General MacArthur was, by United Nations, under whose direction this war is being fought and by direction of the President, charged with carrying on the war in Korea. But apparently because he is under the domination of the British Government, is pro-British in his sympathies, has been and is following the British policy of not too abruptly or completely displeasing Communists, Secretary Acheson seems to be in actual command.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson seems to be not only in charge of our foreign policy but to be directing our military activities. The result is that our men are doomed to fight a war where many of them suffer and some die because of the policy of Acheson, which prohibits the use of all of the implements and agencies of war and which so often in previous wars have been used, not only effectively but decisively.

It, therefore, becomes helpful to consider some of the characteristics of Mr. Acheson. Time does not permit a complete recital of his record. A very few words will throw some light upon his character.

From an intellectual standpoint, Dean Acheson is outstanding. He has never been accused of not knowing exactly what he wanted, nor reluctant to use the methods necessary to attain his objective. Nor has it ever been suggested that he has at any time hesitated to use a procedure which would be helpful to his purpose.

Dean Acheson is a lawyer. He has ability, drive, and persistence. He has a profound conviction in the rightness of his own views. He knows what he wants—has a firm idea as to how to accomplish his purpose and is not hampered by any doubt as to the fairness of his methods.

Dean Acheson is a long-time friend of Alger Hiss. He never was so dumb as to be deceived by Hiss. Any other conclusion would be an insult to his intelligence. He was intimate with Hiss. He frequently exchanged views with Hiss. He was often in personal contact with him. It might be said that he collaborated with him; that they were of one mind on many things.

Hiss denied he was a Communist or had associated with Communists. He was supported in his contentions by Acheson and the State Department. Because he made those denials before a tribunal competent to demand an answer, Hiss deliberately falsified when he made answer. Because of that denial he was convicted of perjury.

That conviction carried with it the conclusion that Hiss had been and was a Communist; that he had associated with Communists and furthered their plans.

Hiss had two trials. He had every influence thrown about him, in his behalf, that the State Department and the executive department as a whole could give him. He had the moral support of at least two Justices of the United States Supreme Court. He had a judge in his first trial who was prejudiced in his favor, as is shown by the record. The trial resulted in a disagreement.

In his second trial the presiding judge was fair. He had a fair trial and was convicted. Hiss was convicted of lying when he denied he was a Communist or had associated with Communists.

After that trial was over Secretary of State Acheson, after ample time to consider, aware of the situation, stated that he retained his friendship for Hiss; that he would not turn his back upon him.

Thus, we have Dean Acheson now administering our foreign policy, flatly, publicly upholding, not only a man who was guilty of deliberate, wicked falsifying, but a man who had deliberately associated with and aided those who sought the overthrow of our Government by illegal means. Has Acheson yet uttered a word repudiating him?

Since that declaration Dean Acheson has given no evidence of a change in his views. Some of his present policies favor the enemy we are now fighting.

More recently, Acheson has impaired the efforts of our Armed Forces to attain victory. It is said that his reason is that the full use of our armed might to win a decisive victory might involve us in a wider, bigger war. But we are in war because, and only because, of the policies which Acheson has supported.

The folly of permitting a man with Acheson's record to misdirect our war efforts is apparent to the American people.

The hundreds of thousands of protests which have come to the President and Congress are conclusive proof that the people will with reluctance, and that is a mild statement, support a war in the direction of which Dean Acheson has any active part.

The President is doing a disservice to this country every day that he retains Dean Acheson in office. Let the President, while insisting that our men fight Communists abroad, remove from the executive departments all those who in the past have followed a course which aided the Communists.

Dean Acheson's removal is not only requested—it is demanded—by the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3842) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SECOND SEMIANNUAL REPORT, MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 329 (81st Cong., 1st sess., 63 Stat. 714), I submit the second semiannual report on the mutual defense assistance program, covering the period from April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.

In making this submission I can do no better than to reiterate the following words which were contained in my letter submitting the first semiannual report on June 1, 1950:

By its enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and by its earlier provision of aid for Greece and Turkey, the Congress of the United States recognized that the security of the United States required a strengthening of the will and ability of certain free nations to resist the aggression with which they were threatened. The preservation of world peace in a form which free peoples could accept depended then, as it depends now, upon the physical capacity and moral determination of the free world to stem those forces which seek to cloak the whole earth with the mantle of totalitarianism. The mutual defense assistance program represents one part of our effort to assist in the development of this essential capacity and determination and, as the attached report clearly demonstrates, is, and must continue to be, an integral part of the total policy of the United States.

Events since that time have proved beyond a reasonable doubt the truth of these principles.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

#### THE WHITE HOUSE,

April 25, 1951.

(Enclosure: Second semiannual report on the mutual defense assistance program, April 6, 1950, to October 6, 1950.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the fourth supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 3842, may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH JUBILEE CELEBRATION

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 204) appointing Members of the House of Representatives to attend and participate in the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee Celebration, to be held in Canberra, Australia, during May 1951.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House is authorized to appoint not more than four Members of the House of Representatives to attend and participate in the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee Celebration to be held at Canberra, Australia, during May 1951. The expenses incurred by the Members and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this resolution shall not exceed \$10,000 and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon submission of vouchers.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the House that such attendance and participation will assist in the furthering of the close relations which exist between the United States and Australia.

SEC. 3. The Members appointed by the Speaker shall file a report on their participation in the jubilee celebration following their return to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri whether or not this was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. CARNAHAN. It was.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ECONOMIC STABILIZATION FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of Fortune magazine contains as the featured article a very intemperate attack upon our farm economy, entitled "The Parity Outrage." This article is another example of the illogical and contradictory effort on the part of large segments of our metropolitan press to blame all of our inflationary troubles upon the American farmer.

The parity concept to provide economic stabilization for American agriculture was designed to protect the basic structure of our whole productive economy. Instead of being shameless example of special privilege, it is an attempt to give the farmer an equal opportunity with those segments of our economy which have traditionally enjoyed special privilege.

There is no need for me to review here the details of how the parity formula works. There is no need for me to point out that except for a costly and unwise venture into price supports for potatoes, that the history of price supports has been an assurance of a minimum return to the farmer without cost to the American taxpayer.

Present high prices are the result of inflationary influences far removed from American farms. Basically they are the result of an inflationary credit policy. We need to apply many remedies, but all economists agree that these remedies should have the end result of removing surplus moneys from bidding in the consumer market.

It is interesting to check into the business policy of this magazine, Fortune, which maintains that the farmer is entitled to no protection from his Government. Fortune magazine is owned and operated by the Luce Publications. Fortune, as well as the other publications of this company, is a member of the National Association of Magazine Publishers, Inc. I am told that Mr. Francis Pratt, circulation manager for Luce Publications, assisted in the drafting of testimony made before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by A. L. Cole on behalf of the National Association of Magazine Publishers.

In his testimony Mr. Cole opposed a proposal now before the Post Office Committee to increase postage rates on magazines to a high enough level to assure these magazines being carried through the mails at no cost to the American taxpayer.

The substance of Mr. Cole's testimony was that the majority of American magazines would operate at a deficit if they did not have the benefit of this postal subsidy. In other words, these magazines now make a profit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I think this contradiction in policy should be called to the attention of the general public. It is a strange fallacy



that this great publication opposes a minimum of assistance without subsidy for the lowest-income group in our country and at the same time wants the Federal Government to continue to subsidize its own enterprise by underwriting a postal deficit which is the principal source of publication profit.

It seems to me that those who come into this fight to strip the farmer or the workman or any other segment of our economy of a minimum of protection should come forward first with clean hands.

#### VINDICATION FOR HONORABLE FRANK BUCHANAN

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman FRANK BUCHANAN, has been in the Naval Hospital for the last several weeks. Yesterday he underwent an operation, and I am happy to report that his condition is good.

Mr. BUCHANAN is one of the most able and one of the finest gentlemen of this House. He rendered a great service to the Nation when he served as chairman of the Lobby Investigating Committee in the last Congress.

This great service has made him the target of a smear attack by totalitarian front organizations and by the peddlers of hate and confusion.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, one of the front organizations exposed by the Buchanan committee, has resorted to dishonest and shameful kind of criticism of Mr. BUCHANAN.

Last week as Mr. BUCHANAN lay in his hospital bed, a Federal jury convicted Dr. Edward A. Rumely, head of this front organization, for contempt of Congress. It took but 20 minutes to reach a verdict.

The guilty verdict is a vindication for Mr. BUCHANAN and justifies the action by Members of the House who voted to indict Dr. Rumely.

The Rumely conviction proves the need for a further probe and more thorough investigation of the Rumely outfit. Rumely has much deeper reasons for his defiance of Congress than he dares to say.

The people of this country have a right to know who puts up the many millions of dollars for the Rumely outfit to pollute the stream of public opinion with totalitarian propaganda. For after all the people pay in taxes for the corporate gifts which are falsely given for educational purposes to this front organization. In other words, the people are taxed to pay for propaganda aimed against their welfare.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

#### DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I recommend that the Congress extend for 2 years the Defense Production Act of 1950, which is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1951. I also recommend that the act be strengthened in certain respects.

The Defense Production Act was enacted in September 1950—2 months after the Communist attack on free Korea had made clear the peril in which all free nations stand. It was a legislative expression of the national resolve to meet the world-wide Communist threat with a vast increase in our military and economic strength.

The act provides the basic authority for our defense mobilization program. It contains specific provisions for expanding production and for maintaining economic stability—the two essentials of the defense program.

Since last summer, we have made a strong beginning in getting defense production started, and we have laid the basis for an effective program to stabilize prices and the cost of living.

We have doubled the number of men in our active Armed Forces since last June. We have nearly doubled the rate of production of military planes during the past year. Monthly deliveries of military equipment and supplies have doubled since last June. In Europe, we have joined our associates in the North Atlantic Treaty in establishing a unified defense force, to be made up of units from the treaty countries, under the command of General Eisenhower. The mutual-defense assistance program has been stepped up substantially, and other free nations, particularly in Europe, are rapidly enlarging their defense establishments, as we are.

Since last summer, we have taken initial actions in the fields of taxes, credit controls, price and wage controls, and other measures necessary to stop inflation and keep it stopped.

No one should deceive himself, however, by assuming that we can now relax our strenuous efforts. Quite the opposite is true. What we have done so far consists essentially of laying a solid basis for future effort.

The major impact of the military build-up on our economy is still to come. Our planned expansion of defense production will not reach its peak for at least a year—and the inflationary pressures brought on by the defense effort likewise have not yet reached their peak.

The blunt fact is that the hardest part of the job still lies ahead. Nothing could be more foolhardy than to slacken the intensity of our defense mobilization effort just because we have gotten off to a good start.

When the Congress passed the Defense Production Act and when it passed the military appropriations acts, it clearly intended that we should proceed with all speed to strengthen ourselves and join in strengthening the forces of freedom throughout the world. I have heard no voice raised in favor of turning back before the job is finished.

The full range of powers included in the Defense Production Act will be needed—and needed badly—until we are "over the hump" in our defense-mobilization program. We hope that will be about 2 years from now—always assuming that world war is avoided. All our plans must recognize, of course, that while we hope we can influence the actions of aggressors, we cannot control them—we hope we can prevent general war, but there is no way we can be sure.

For at least the next 2 years we shall be driving urgently forward in our defense-mobilization program. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance that the Defense Production Act be extended for that period.

#### DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Titles I, II, and III of the act relate to production.

Since June 1950, the Government has placed orders for planes, tanks, guns, and other military equipment, facilities, and supplies in the amount of over 26 billion dollars. As yet, only a small part of these orders have been filled and the goods delivered. Furthermore, over 58 billion dollars more in orders have yet to be placed before the end of June 1952.

This is a tough production program because we must build our strength as rapidly as we can. The world situation could explode at any time, and we must make every day count.

Consequently, the Government is using extensively the powers granted in the Defense Production Act to divert materials and plants from less important to more important uses. Under these powers, important metals, chemicals, and other materials—including such basic materials as steel, copper, and aluminum—are being controlled and channeled to the places they are most needed.

For the next year, at least, it is obvious that controls over materials will have to become tighter and tighter, as more and more of them will be diverted to essential production. Consequently, the allocations and priorities systems authorized in the Defense Production Act will be even more necessary than they are now.

There is much more to our production program, however, than simply diverting scarce materials and converting existing plants to defense production. As a Nation, we are expanding our ability to produce minerals and fuels; we are building new factories and transportation facilities—we are enlarging the economic capacity of the country, so that, in time, we shall be able to support a high level of military strength, resume our progress in raising living standards, and be stronger for meeting any new military demands.

For example, the capacity of the steel industry, which was 100,000,000 tons a year last June, will be expanded, within 2 years, to at least 117,000,000 tons a year. The aluminum industry had a capacity last June of 750,000 tons a year; by 1953 it should rise to 1,300,000 tons. The electric power capacity of the Nation—67,500,000 kilowatts at the beginning of this year—is being rapidly increased; we need to add at least 22,000,000 more kilowatts in the next 3 years.

The Defense Production Act carries powers under which the Government is helping to build new plants and finance additional output. The Government is making or guaranteeing loans to private businessmen. It is buying some critical materials and equipment—particularly imported materials—and reselling them to private businessmen. It is also supporting the development of new domestic and foreign sources of supply for vital materials. These powers will have to be used to an increasing extent as our defense production expands.

In addition to these production aids under the Defense Production Act, under the Revenue Act of 1950 the Government is allowing businessmen, in certain cases, to write off part of the cost of new plants and equipment needed in the defense effort more rapidly than the usual depreciation periods under the tax laws. Some 5 billion dollars' worth of new plant construction is being encouraged in this way.

Even with the existing production aids, it may not be possible to obtain the supplies and equipment needed unless the Government is given one power to help expand defense production which it does not now have. That is the general power, which was used extensively and successfully in World War II, to build defense plants. At the present time, with some exceptions, whether or not defense plants are built depends finally upon the decision of private businessmen. Certainly if private businessmen can and will build all the necessary facilities, without excessive cost to the taxpayers, that is preferable. But first and foremost, the Government must have the authority to obtain essential production.

To help expand defense production, the Government also needs the power to give special financial aid to high-cost producers in order to obtain essential production from them without increasing price ceilings. Such differential subsidies were used very successfully in World War II, and saved American consumers and taxpayers many millions of dollars, because it was much cheaper to subsidize some high-cost producers than to raise prices on the entire production of the commodities affected.

In summary, to accomplish our defense-production goals, the Defense Production Act should be extended and strengthened, and adequate funds to carry out its provisions should be authorized.

#### ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

Titles IV, V, and VI of the Defense Production Act relate to stabilization.

It will be a tough job to accomplish the production goals of our defense effort. It will, in many respects, be even harder to prevent our defense effort from resulting in skyrocketing prices—with increased defense costs, disruption of production, and hardship for millions of families.

For the next 2 or 3 years, the economy will be running at forced draft. Industrial production and employment will be reaching new records. People will be working longer hours, many at overtime pay. Farmers will be producing and selling more crops. All of this will mean higher incomes—more money available for people to spend. At the same time, much of our manpower and plant capacity will be diverted to building defense plants and producing military goods—leaving that much less civilian goods for people to buy.

More money to spend than there are goods to buy—that creates the so-called inflationary gap. Without an effective stabilization program, the excess spending power could be translated into higher and higher prices.

If we are successful in preventing another world war, at the end of 2 or 3 years we should be able to close the inflationary gap by producing enough civilian goods to match the buying power of businesses and consumers. This can be done when our expenditures for military purposes and for new plants will have leveled off—and the vastly increased productive power of the country can be devoted in greater proportion to civilian goods.

But in the meantime, until we are "over the hump," we face an extremely difficult problem in stopping inflation.

Fortunately, we are now in a relatively good position to prepare for the tough period ahead. After the Korean invasion, and again after the Chinese intervention, there were speculative buying rushes by businessmen and consumers which, coupled with the expansion of defense orders, resulted in prices surging upward. The wholesale price index rose 16 percent from June 27, 1950, to February 6, 1951. The index of consumer prices rose 8 percent from June 15, 1950, to February 15, 1951.

Now, however, tax, credit, and price and wage control actions have taken hold. Production has increased substantially, and the buying wave has—at least for the time being—died down. Consequently, the upward rush of prices has been checked. The wholesale price index rose only 0.5 percent between February 6 and April 17, 1951. The latest consumers' price index figures, those of March 15, show a rise of only 0.4 percent in the month following February 15—the first full month of price control. We have made a good beginning and we must now go on to achieve more complete stabilization.

We are now having something of a "breathing spell." But it will not last. This fall and winter the economy will be hit by the full impact of military production. Supplies of civilian goods will be reduced while larger production, em-

ployment, and military spending will be putting still greater buying power in the hands of the public.

Inflationary pressures, which are serious now, will be critical then. We must therefore use the present period to get prepared for the hard problems which lie ahead. The present "breathing spell" is a fortunate occurrence—it gives us a chance to get hold of the price structure and build a set of controls which will hold firm. This opportunity will not come again. We must not waste it. The executive agencies will do their utmost with the powers they have and the Congress will need to enact additional legislation.

In taking action now, our simple, central goal must be to bring the rise in prices and the cost of living to a halt—and hold the line. It will take strong and determined measures to do that.

1. Most important of all, we must increase taxes quickly and adequately—paying for Government expenditures as we go, through a fair tax program. This will spread the cost of defense equitably and help stop the inflationary spiral.

2. We must increase personal savings—dollars saved now are subtracted from the buying power pushing prices upward, and will be available later when more consumer goods will be produced.

3. We must reduce borrowing and buying on credit for nondefense purposes—by consumers and businessmen—since borrowed money adds to the pressure on prices.

4. We must have fair ceilings on prices, including the prices of farm products, and on rents, in order to stabilize the cost of living during the defense period, to hold down the cost of the defense program to the taxpayers, and to prevent profiteering.

5. We must stabilize wages and salaries at fair levels, to restrain excessive consumer demand and to prevent rising business costs from forcing price increases.

This is an anti-inflation program that will work. It includes measures to absorb excess purchasing power, and measures to stop prices and costs from jumping upward. This program will work if all these measures are employed to support and reinforce one another. We must fight inflation on every front and with every possible weapon if we are to succeed.

#### TAXES

A large Federal deficit would be a powerful inflationary force, because the Government would be pouring more money into the economy than it was taking from it. The effects would be multiplied in a period of rising expenditures, when Government orders and the private borrowing and spending which they stimulate exceed the actual budget expenditure figures.

An effective stabilization program requires that we hold Federal expenditures to the minimum necessary for national security and a strong Nation. The January budget reflects such a policy, and I know the Congress will apply the same standard in reviewing it.



An effective stabilization program also requires that taxes be high enough at least to balance the budget.

The Federal Government will show a surplus for the current fiscal year, ending on June 30. This is a good record. But, unfortunately it does not mean we are on a pay-as-we-go basis. During the present quarter and from here on out, until taxes are raised, we will be operating at a deficit. The latest figures show that to balance the budget as defense outlays continue to rise will require the Congress to enact during this year at least the 10 billion dollars in additional taxes I have recommended.

The people of our country are going to have to pay for the defense program sometime; the sensible thing to do is for us to pay for it as we go, through fair taxes.

#### SAVINGS

This is also the sensible time to put every possible dollar into savings. Every additional dollar saved helps hold down the cost of living, and puts aside money that will be available later on, when consumer goods are again plentiful.

During World War II, the American people invested unprecedented amounts in savings bonds, thus withdrawing billions of dollars which otherwise would have pushed prices upward during the war; after the war those savings helped many a family. It is vital again now to encourage savings, through payroll savings plans and other regular methods of saving bond purchase, and through encouraging people to hold on to their savings bonds as they come due, and thereby earn more interest.

The most effective way of all to assure adequate saving is to provide convincing assurance to savers that inflation will not cut down the value of their savings. This is one of the many reasons why we need to increase taxes and to extend and strengthen present economic stabilization legislation.

#### CREDIT CONTROLS

Credit controls, like taxation and savings, attack inflation at the source, by reducing purchasing power which would otherwise be directly used to bid up the prices of goods.

A good deal has been done since last June to curtail the expansion of consumer- and real-estate credit. Higher down payments and quicker payment of balances are being required of buyers of new houses, automobiles, household appliances, and other durable goods. These credit controls are already showing good results—for example, the amount of credit outstanding to buyers of automobiles, which had risen steadily since 1945, has declined every month since last October and total installment credit dropped by about half a billion dollars in the first 3 months of this year. The provisions in the Defense Production Act authorizing such credit controls need to be extended; furthermore, we need the authority to control credit terms on the sale of existing houses, as well as new ones.

We are in a less favorable situation regarding bank credit to businessmen. Bank loans have risen, week after week,

almost without interruption. Many of these loans are necessary—for example, loans to businessmen to expand defense production. But it is very important to cut down on unnecessary loans. Non-essential business investments should be deferred because they compete for scarce materials and manpower.

Several steps have been taken to dampen bank-credit expansion. The discount rates of the Federal Reserve banks have been raised. The Federal Reserve Board has increased the reserve requirements of member banks almost to the legal maximum. The Treasury has offered long-term nonmarketable bonds in exchange for long-term marketable bonds, in order to cut down the supply of securities that might be used for credit expansion. In addition, the Federal Reserve Board has recently requested all banks and other lenders to cut down on their nonessential lending. Government lending agencies are already applying strict standards in screening and limiting their loans.

It is not yet clear whether further actions will be needed, but we should obviously be prepared to take them. The Government has certain emergency powers it can use to place direct controls over bank lending, if that proves to be necessary. In addition, I believe that the Federal Reserve Board should be given authority by the Congress to impose additional requirements for bank reserves. I expect to transmit specific recommendations on this subject to the Congress in the near future.

Furthermore, I recommend that the Congress authorize the control of margins for speculation on commodity futures markets. Whenever the speculative fever hits these markets, we should be able to dampen it promptly with reasonable requirements for minimum margins. This is the same kind of authority which the Federal Reserve Board now exercises in respect to the stock markets.

#### PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Price and wage controls do not cure the basic cause of inflation—the inflationary gap between the supply of goods and the volume of buying power.

The cure can come about only by closing the gap, through tax, saving, and credit programs which reduce the demand for goods, on the one hand, and production programs which increase the supply, on the other. But until the inflationary gap is closed through these measures, price and wage controls are indispensable in checking the price rises which otherwise would result. At the present time, it is clear that these controls must be maintained and strengthened.

On January 26, a general ceiling price regulation was issued, freezing most prices at the highest level they had reached in the previous 4 weeks. At the same time, a similar regulation stopped, for the time being, further wage increases.

Both the price and wage freezes of January were intended as emergency measures to hold down price and wage increases temporarily, until more work-

able regulations could be developed and the staff assembled to put them into effect. These January regulations were a necessary step. But, inevitably, they froze all sorts of distortions and inequities into the price and wage structure.

They left some sellers operating at a loss, and others making excessive profits. They caught many retailers in an unfavorable position as against their wholesalers; many wholesalers as against manufacturers; many manufacturers as against raw materials producers. They caught many workers in the process of negotiating for wage adjustments which other workers had already obtained.

Many of these kinks in the price-wage structure have to be ironed out in order to achieve a situation which is fair and reasonable enough to hold firm against the new inflationary pressures we expect. Necessarily, there will continue to be some differences in the impact of price and wage regulations as among individuals or firms; these will be minimized, but they are inevitable if we are to have real stabilization.

In the case of prices, the Office of Price Stabilization has been moving ahead with the adjustment process since the January freeze. Adjustments have been completed for many products and industries, but not for all. Roll-backs from January prices have been required on a number of raw materials and finished products. More roll-backs are planned. In other cases, some price increases will have to be allowed where sellers are caught unfairly between high costs and low prices. But these increases must be held to the minimum that will result in adequate production and reasonable returns. The upward spiraling of prices which is involved in translating cost increases into price increases must be prevented.

The Office of Price Stabilization expects to complete this adjustment process in the near future, and to have then a firm structure of price control with prices on the average very close to the January level. This adjusted price structure is the line we propose to hold against the new inflationary pressures which we foresee.

The Office of Price Stabilization will move as rapidly as is administratively feasible to apply a general standard of not permitting price increases in any industry when the level of profits for that industry is more than 85 percent of its average profits for the best 3 of 4 years 1946-49.

This standard is roughly the same as that used in the excess profits tax law, and is fair and reasonable during a time of national emergency. Corporate profits are now running at the all-time record rate of 48 billion dollars a year—more than 14 billion dollars higher than in 1948, and about 20 billion dollars higher than in 1949. There is clearly room for cost absorption in profits such as these.

In addition, the Office of Price Stabilization has been directed to work out

specific dollars and cents ceilings on individual commodities wherever possible. This is of vital importance both as a means of checking unwarranted price increases and in order that the buying public may know the legal price and help enforce it.

In the case of wages, unfortunately, the process of changing over from the wage freeze to a fair longer-run wage stabilization program was interrupted by the split-up of the Wage Stabilization Board in February. In the absence of a Board, only slow progress has been made toward establishing fair and workable wage stabilization policies.

Within the last week, however, I have issued an Executive order reestablishing the Wage Stabilization Board. The further development of fair wage stabilization policies for the longer run should now go rapidly forward. In formulating such policies, many factors will have to be weighed, including changes in the cost of living, substandards of living, and cases of hardship or inequity. At the same time, it is obvious that workers will have to forego substantial increases in wages which would be permissible if the danger of inflation were not so great—just as businessmen and farmers will have to forego substantial increases in income for the same reason.

The Defense Production Act has special provisions regarding ceilings on farm products. It prohibits setting price ceilings on agricultural commodities below either the parity price or the highest price attained in the May 24–June 24, 1950, period, whichever is higher. This provision has led to considerable misunderstanding; it has often been said to prevent price ceilings on farm products. This is, of course, not so. Prices of several of the major farm products, including meats, cotton, and wool, are above the legal minimums and consequently are subject to price ceilings. For example, a dollars-and-cents ceiling has been placed on cotton at the producer level.

Prices paid to farmers for some farm commodities, however, are below parity. These prices cannot be controlled, under the present law, until they rise to the parity level. This has led to some proposals to change the law to permit price ceilings to be placed on farm products below parity levels. I do not believe such proposals are justified under present circumstances. The parity principle, which is the basis for our agricultural laws, is the best guide we now have available to judge what is a fair return to farmers.

I do believe, however, that for price control purposes, the parity price for each commodity prevailing at the start of its normal marketing season should be applied throughout the balance of the marketing season, just as is the case in most of our agricultural price-support programs. I recommend that the Defense Production Act be amended to provide for this. Under this amendment, the parity price will continue to be a minimum standard for each price ceiling. The amendment will, however, substantially improve the administration of price control on food products and will forestall the inflationary effects of frequent

changes in the computation of the parity price of individual farm commodities.

The current outlook is for stable food prices, at least for some months to come. However, if we find that we cannot hold the line on food prices with the powers recommended here we shall need to consider legislation authorizing the use of other devices, including limited food subsidies, to prevent necessary farm price increases from being reflected in rises in the cost of living. Such subsidies were very successful in World War II and saved consumers and taxpayers far more than they cost. The stabilization agencies are keeping close watch on the areas where need for these subsidies may develop, and the Congress will be kept informed.

Price controls will be successful only if buyers and sellers are well informed about what the law and regulations require. The Office of Price Stabilization is now doing its best to inform them. But there is need also for tough and aggressive enforcement action against the small minority who would willfully violate the law. The Defense Production Act needs to be strengthened in a number of respects to tighten up the Government's enforcement powers. For example, the courts should be given authority to impose higher civil penalties for violations than the law now permits.

#### RENT CONTROL

A serious deficiency in the present stabilization structure is the absence of an effective rent-control law. For millions of families with low or moderate income, rent accounts for as much as 15 percent or more of the total family budget. If costs of living are to be stabilized it is obvious that increases in rents must be stopped and the line held, just as with other prices.

There is still in effect a rent-control law, due to expire on June 30. We are fortunate that this law is still on the books. But it is entirely inadequate to help meet the inflationary pressures which will confront us in the coming months.

The present law was enacted before the Korean outbreak as a last step in the liquidation of the rent controls left over from the war. About 6.7 million housing units are still under Federal control, compared to 16 million housing units under control at the peak of the World War II rent-control program. In addition, one State and one municipality have control measures of their own.

Before the Korean outbreak, it was contemplated that Federal control would be removed from these last remaining units by June 30, 1951, at the latest. Since Korea, however, reactivation of military camps and other installations in various parts of the country has placed great pressures on nearby housing accommodations and in a number of instances has brought a shocking increase in rents. This has become a heavy and totally unjustified burden on many men in service. In some communities where rents have been decontrolled, servicemen's rents have risen as much as 100 percent. In some defense areas, also, expansion of production facilities by pri-

vate industry and by the military services or the Atomic Energy Commission has begun to send rents soaring. Over the Nation as a whole, the volume of new housing—which was helping to relieve the housing shortage and the pressure on rent levels—has had to be sharply curtailed.

All of these circumstances call for new rent legislation. The Government should have power to establish rent controls in any community where they are needed to stabilize the situation, stop profiteering, and hold down living costs. Of course, if State and local action results in holding rents to reasonable levels, the Federal Government would not act.

In addition to the control of rents on residential housing, an effective stabilization program in this period requires that the Government be able to control business rents. Rents are an important part of the cost of doing business at wholesale and retail levels. With the high levels of business activity, sales and warehouse space has been at a premium for many months. Business rents are rising in many cities and further sharp increases are threatened in the coming months. Unless controls are authorized, many businesses, particularly small firms, will face rent and hence cost increases which will either drive them out of business or require a break in price ceilings.

The keystone of our stabilization program is to share fairly the necessary burdens imposed by the defense effort. We can do this best by holding the cost of living stable, by preventing profiteering by anyone, and by paying for our military needs through higher taxes. A rounded stabilization program, such as I have outlined, can accomplish these ends.

#### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

In this message I have discussed the more important of the amendments which I believe should be made in the Defense Production Act at this time. Others will be presented to the congressional committees by appropriate officials of the executive branch.

In summary, the more important amendments to the act which I now recommend would:

1. Extend the life of the act for 2 years, until June 30, 1953.
2. Authorize the Government to build and operate defense plants where necessary to produce essential materials and equipment.
3. Permit the use of differential subsidies to obtain essential production from high-cost sources of supply without increasing price ceilings.
4. Provide for controls over credit on existing housing, and regulation of speculative trading on commodity exchanges.
5. Allow the parity price for each farm commodity as of the beginning of its marketing season to be used for price-control purposes throughout the marketing season.
6. Provide stronger means to enforce price-control regulations.
7. Authorize effective control over both residential and commercial rents, wherever needed to stabilize the cost of living and the cost of doing business.



If, as we proceed with the defense-mobilization program, it becomes evident that we need further legislative action to assure that our goals are met, I shall make further recommendations to the Congress.

While the Congress is considering these proposals and enacting those which it deems desirable, the executive branch will continue to use vigorously the range of powers it has now. In the course of its forthcoming deliberations, the Congress will have available to it for consideration all of the experience and information which the executive agencies can provide.

We are engaged in a historic effort to hold together all of the free peoples of the world in the face of the greatest danger ever confronting them. As a leader in that effort, we must demonstrate to the whole world that the founding fathers were wise in their faith that our Government of divided powers would never suffer disunity or frustrate necessary action in time of peril. The executive branch and the Congress are both responsive to the American people—and the needs of the people are now both clear and imperative.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 26, 1951.

#### SUSPENSION OF IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3336) to suspend certain import taxes on copper, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York, JENKINS, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of my friend from Indiana, may I say that on Monday next the Consent Calendar will be called, and then we will take up the bill H. R. 3576, which amends the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. Following that will be general debate on the Independent Offices Appropriation bill for 1952.

I do not know that there is any opposition to the displaced persons bill, since it was reported unanimously out of committee, but if there should be any roll call on Monday on that bill, is it agreeable to the gentleman from Indiana that the roll call take place the following day?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have to bracket together the legislation that will be taken up on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, because of the uncertainty as to the termination of debate and the completion of the appropriation bills. However, on Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and then there will be a continuation of the consideration of the bill H. R. 3790, the Interior Department appropriation bill, under the 5-minute rule. Following the disposition of that bill, the Independent Offices appropriation bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule.

On the completion of that bill, we will take up H. R. 3791, the India emergency food relief bill. If time allows the bill H. R. 2084, dealing with the power of appointment and reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, will be taken up.

If there are any changes in the program of course they will be announced as quickly as possible, and the leadership on the Republican side will be so advised.

Of course, as usual, conference reports may be called up at any time.

#### FASCISTS AND COMMUNISTS BOTH WANT A TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress and the country generally have done a good job on stopping communism. We have certainly done everything within the power of the Congress to stop any sign of communism inside of the Government and outside of the Government. Not only has the legislative branch of our Government done a wonderful job in that direction, but the executive branch also has done a good job in that direction, and we have also had the cooperation of the judiciary. The three branches of the Government have been working together very well, I think, to stop the spread of communism. In addition our boys have been doing a good job on the field of battle in places, although far removed from our own country, nevertheless where we believe it is necessary for them to fight in order to let the aggressors know that we mean business and we are willing to fight in order to secure peace.

While we have been on the alert to stop communism and we should continue to be on the alert to stop communism and continue to do everything within our power to stop any progress of any kind in that direction, we should not overlook the trend toward fascism. The Communists and the Fascists work in different ways, but when they get to

the point that they expect to get, namely, when they reach their goal, it means one thing, a totalitarian government, a dictatorship. Whether it is approaching us from the left or whether it is approaching us from the right, it amounts to the same thing in the end.

The Communists' methods and habits and policies are well known, but the methods and habits and policies of the Fascists are not quite so well known. But we do know from studying the history of other countries, especially of Italy and Germany, that certain things happen when the road is being paved for a Fascist highway. Many of the things that happen in Germany and Italy are happening in this country today and have been happening here for the last few years. I look upon this with fear. I hope the country will always be on the alert, not only against communism, but also against fascism. If those who would lead us down the road to fascism continue to try to cause confusion and consternation and distrust of Government officials and distrust of anybody and everybody in public office, finally they hope that we will reach the point where they can say, "We cannot trust anybody in Government, either locally or in our Capitol in Washington. We need a few business or industrial leaders to take over and save our country." That is what happened in other countries. That could happen here.

Mr. Speaker, we have the finest, greatest, and best Government on the face of the earth. I think it is a well-balanced Government. We have a Congress of 531 Members, with 435 Representatives in the House of Representatives elected according to the population of the States, and they are selected for 2 years. That means something. It means that every 2 years the people have the power to change even their form of government or the trend in their government if they so desire by electing their representatives to this great body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do not quarrel with what the gentleman said with respect to the Congress, but did I understand him to say that it is some evidence that the fascists may be taking over if businessmen and industrial people come to Washington to help out in connection with the great defense effort that presently confronts it?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman misunderstood me. I commend them for doing that. They did a fine job in World War II, as well as now, but I was not speaking of them in that sense at all, and I was not speaking of those particular people at all. I said let us hope that the time will not come when there will be such confusion and consternation that those people who would carry us down the highway of fascism will be looking around for somebody to ride the big white horse—big business and industrial leaders, who say they are the only ones who can save us. That has happened in other countries, and we hope it does not happen here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. About 16 years ago this House authorized the appointment of a special committee to investigate communism, fascism, nazism, bigotry, and all other fakirs of that kind. If there is anybody I have contempt for it is a person who has a mind of hate, and I despise a bigot. They are everywhere. Fortunately, we have no tremendous organization now, but the American people must always be watchful of any such movement of that kind.

A little over 20 years ago we had such a movement against the Catholics of the country, and it was brought to the forefront in the Alfred E. Smith campaign which, from a political angle, represents unfortunate pages in American history, but from an historical angle, as we look back, it had a very clarifying effect, as far as Americans who are Catholics are concerned, of which I am one. But we had it manifested in other directions. I can remember in that investigation there was a certain group of powerful businessmen in this country who thought that all of their property and wealth was going to be taxed away from them. They sent men into the youth camps to approach the officers in there to form veteran Fascist organizations. They also sent representatives abroad to study veterans' organizations in Fascist countries abroad. His report was that there should be veterans' organizations in America, especially along the line of the Fascist veterans' organization in France. Very few paid attention to what the committee did on that occasion. However, every bill that we recommended became law, despite the opposition that existed. One of the pieces of legislation was the Foreign Agent Registration Act, which I drafted and introduced, and which was called the McCormack Act. The other was the Smith Act, so-called. It was under legislation that we recommended that the 11 Communists in New York were convicted. That came out of the special committee of which I was chairman. Another one was giving the Army and the Navy the power to control subversive activities in camps, and in navy yards, and on board ship.

Then, in their desperation they approached the late Gen. Smedley Butler, and they wanted him to become the head of this organization. It was fantastic. It is hard to believe, but actually it is a fact. That was 16 years ago. As the gentleman says, it is not beyond the realm of possibility. All of us should vigorously watch any kind of efforts toward a dictatorship, whether to the left or to the right, because history shows

that whenever the right dictatorship has obtained control of the people, invariably when that collapses the Communists take over.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks. I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives at the time the gentleman was chairman of the first committee which could have been known as Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the RECORD to show that it is to the credit of the late Gen. Smedley Butler, who was the enlisted man's general, as we all remember, that he just used them as a come-on. He was exposing the plot and getting information from those who approached him in order to expose them; and he rendered great service on that occasion as he did throughout his entire life. I want the RECORD to show that General Butler, while approached was simply using those who approached him to get information for the purpose of exposing them, which he did, when we had him before my special committee as a witness.

Mr. PATMAN. I have some information about that and I agree with the gentleman. Gen. Smedley Butler was known as the enlisted man's general. He was just a plain person, but he was an outstanding general; and when they approached him the times were very difficult in this country, you know; people were without jobs, twelve or fifteen million people did not have a place to work; they did not earn money; they had no checks of any kind coming to them; they had no savings; they were almost starving; they were desperate. Gen. Smedley Butler was approached by the other side, the wealthy ones from the right, knowing his contact and sympathy with the under dog, that large group out of employment that would likely do anything in desperation; Gen. Smedley Butler was approached for the purpose of being the man to ride the big white horse I was talking about awhile ago. He was approached by the people from the right. They were not hungry; they were not without jobs; they had everything. They were men of tremendous wealth. They also had the idea that the gold standard was the only thing that would save the United States of America, and they claimed they wanted to preserve, protect, and defend the gold standard; and in order to do that they had to have this organization of these great business and industrial leaders led by Gen. Smedley Butler really to take over the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. But Gen. Smedley Butler, although he was willing to talk

to them and to find out what they wanted to do and to get their offers, was telling the distinguished chairman of the committee all the time, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], now majority leader in this great body; and the gentleman from Massachusetts as chairman of the first Un-American Activities Committee did a wonderful job. He held his hearings in secret executive session; he did not have any publicity man to run out and tell the press agents all the time about something sensational or startling that would go into the headlines—never, not one time did he do that. On the other hand he had these sessions in private; he took down the testimony, and after the hearings were over and he could absolutely prove and establish to a certainty the facts, he held public hearings. The hearings were printed and made available to Members of Congress; they are available now, and they would open your eyes if you were to read them. By reason of the report of that first committee by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] certain recommendations were made as to laws that ought to be passed in order to provide proper security to our Nation against sabotage, and every one of those proposals was enacted into law; and every one of the convictions of the Communists and others have been under acts for which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was responsible. He really got something done. But now we are approaching a time just as dangerous.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I properly understand from what the gentleman is saying that he is concerned for fear the condition of the Government and the country is so bad that this man he envisions riding a big white horse is about to take over?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the Government is not.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman does not believe that—

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer. The gentleman has brought up the matter, has asked the question; now I concede to myself the right to answer and I hope the gentleman will permit me to answer. The Government is in a very sound condition. There is no question about that. There has never been a time in the history of this Nation or any nation on the face of the earth when there was greater evidence of loyalty and honesty in Government than during the last 18 years in the United States and since the gentleman mentioned that I want to invite his attention to the fact that commencing in the early part of 1933, March 4, to be exact, up until the present time, in order to whip the greatest depression in our history when 15,000,000 people were walking the streets and highways unemployed, and in order to win the greatest war in our history, when 15,200,000 men and women were enlisted and commissioned in the Armed Forces of our Government in World War II, in addition to the deficit that was created in our financing, we actually collected



from the taxpayers and actually spent \$500,000,000,000. I do not mean million, I mean billion. That is a half trillion dollars. And up to this good day with all the congressional investigations by the Democrats, by the Republicans, by the State legislatures, and of all the accusations that have been made by commentators, columnists, and everybody else, not one person has even accused President Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Harry Truman or those closely connected with them with fraudulently taking or fraudulently misapplying one red copper cent, or as much as one red copper cent of that money. That is honesty in government. You cannot eliminate all dishonesty. But, I repeat, generally we have had the finest, the greatest, the most honorable and honest Government in this country during the last 18 years or that any country on the face of the earth has ever experienced or has ever enjoyed.

That is due to the fact we have such a wonderful system. Every 2 years the Members of this House must be elected. Our old forefathers were very wise when they said that certain bills can only originate in the House of Representatives, they may not originate in the other body, which means that every 2 years the people have complete control over their Congress through the election of 435 Representatives. And I am not one who is advocating the changing of that to 4 or 6 years. It ought to remain at 2 years. Two years is long enough for a sorry Representative to serve and a good one will not have any trouble getting reelected at the end of that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it should remain just exactly like it is.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been trying to determine in my own mind just what the gentleman is getting at. I do not want the folks out in the country to think that all of us down here are crooks, because we are not.

Mr. PATMAN. No, just the opposite.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot do anything but reach the conclusion that the gentleman must be very much disturbed, else he would not be up here talking about these things.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I am disturbed that there is such an effort being made to mislead and deceive the people. These efforts are not new, they have been going on for a long time, but I do not know that they have been in such strong hands as they are today. For that reason I do not know what might happen.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

XCVII—281

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have reference in that comment to the two estimable gentlemen who belong to the other body, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am not talking about any person in either body, I assure the gentleman.

Now, that is a good system of ours. Every 2 years, the Representatives are elected in this House. You know, those great wise men who wrote our Constitution said that as to the executive branch of the Government the people should be allowed to change the President or the Executive every 4 years. That is a good balance. Every 2 years the Members of the House, who can really run the Government, are elected. If there is a bad trend, it can be corrected, and if it is a good trend, it can continue, and in the other body it is every 6 years. One-third of the 96 Senators are elected every 2 years. That makes a good balance. Then with the judiciary, that is not tied up with either the executive branch or the legislative branch, they are selected for life or during good behavior. I do not know, if we were trying to write another Constitution and trying to have a good balance between the people and their representative bodies and their executive branch of the Government, having in mind the judiciary, in interpreting the laws, that we could possibly improve on the great system we have today and that we have had for over 160 years.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I know the gentleman has in mind evidence that the special committee, of which I was chairman, uncovered 16 years ago, which was amazing, and I am sure the gentleman sees similar signs today, probably even more aggravated and more broadly distributed and felt than they were then. I could mention names right out of one big financial house in New York City, but it is unnecessary on this occasion. I assume, in answer to my dear friend's inquiry, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that my friend from Texas has in mind that old wise saying "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We are always to be on our guard and always cautious. My friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is calmly and dispassionately calling attention to our colleagues and the people in this country that this is the time to be very careful the same as it was 16 years ago.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate we must continue to fight communism with all our power and might. We should not cease our efforts in that direction at any time. At the same time, let us remain on the alert against an equally devastating enemy whose ugly head is rearing itself in many places in the United States today, and let us be on the lookout and the watchout and on the alert against any trends toward fascism.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial, and also to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous material therewith.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include short excerpts from General MacArthur's speech and a short excerpt from the New Yorker magazine.

Mr. JONAS (at the request of Mr. Gross) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of Dr. Hutchinson.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by James Berryman.

Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, April 30-May 5, on account of Small Business Committee hearings.

To Mr. ELSTON (at the request of Mr. HESS), for 4 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. WHITTEN), on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for the week of April 30 to May 6, on account of official business.

To Mr. ROBINO (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for Thursday, April 26, 1951, on account of official business.

To Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for Thursday, April 26, 1951, on account of official business.

To Mr. CHATHAM (at the request of Mr. GORDON), for week of April 30 to May 6, on account of official business.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found

truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

408. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report of Veterans' Canteen Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the requirement contained in section 7 of the act of August 7, 1946 (38 U. S. C. 13f) (H. Doc. No. 117), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3605. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute employees in the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H. R. 3860. A bill to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3861. A bill to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3862. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3863. A bill to authorize coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 3864. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 3865. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3866. A bill providing that gain realized on the sale or exchange of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 3867. A bill to prohibit the Government from furnishing stamped envelopes containing any lithographing, engraving, or printing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3868. A bill to provide that patents created and held by individual taxpayers shall be treated as capital assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3869. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3870. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine certain claims of oyster growers for damages caused to oyster beds in the United States resulting from wartime naval operations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3871. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3872. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of the unobligated portion of the amount appropriated for the Department of State so long as the present Secretary of State remains in office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the field service of the Post Office Department, for the purpose of considering and devising plans for the complete reorganization of such field service; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANTAFF: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida to the Congress of the United States requesting the abolition of certain provisions of the laws of the United States of America invoked by the Social Security Administration as the basis for regulations for withholding information as to the names and other information concerning persons who are recipients of welfare payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging legislation to require the publication of names of all persons, firms, and corporations who are doing business with Communist countries and to bar such persons from doing business with the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan relative to requesting the enactment of legislation

amending the Federal Income Tax Act with respect to exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to requesting the inclusion in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a second entrance to Honolulu Harbor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 3874. A bill for the relief of Teruko Kodama and her child George Kodama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 3875. A bill for the relief of William Hewson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Erlinda Maria Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3878. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Andrew Johnson, Alexander H. Tongue, James F. Sirlouis, James W. Dixon, J. Frank Tongue, Thomas E. Wroten, Halvor H. Hellen, George J. Carey, Robert C. O'Berry, Norman C. Carey, James W. Hungerford, Sarah E. Webster, Nathaniel M. Dare, and Richard J. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3879. A bill for the relief of Charles Cutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Roger T. Nooe, minister ecumenical, Vine Street Christian Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose will is our peace, grant that in these times that try the souls of men we may have the wisdom to know Thy way, the courage to dare, and the love to share, with a world unknowing, blind, and unconsoled. Amid the babel of the world's confusion, grant by Thy grace to bestow upon these Thy servants the high privilege of hearing that one voice as the sound of many waters, until they shall make all gifts and all interests consecrate to Thee, to the end that, being master workmen with Thee, they may have a right worthy part in making Thy will to be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In quiet and confidence teach us that our tensions may become growing edges for triumphs of the spirit. Show us that if we would survive, we must seek for more than survival, that making strong our outer defenses we shall be renewed in devotion to those principles that can never die.